



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2001

No. 143

## Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN NELSON, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Imam Yusuf Saleem.

### PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, Imam Yusuf Saleem, Resident Imam of Masjid Muhammad and National Educational Director for the Muslim American Society, offered the following prayer:

With God's name, the Merciful Benefactor, the Merciful Redeemer. We seek Your guidance, Your mercy, and Your forgiveness, that this body of servants to God and this country will be blessed with hindsight, insight, and foresight as only You can provide. Supply this elected assembly, entrusted by our Nation's citizens to ultimately trust the Creator of us all. As defined by humans, these are delicate times, but still we know it is Your times. So let truth, excellence, justice, and service lead the intellect and souls of our Senate. Yes, God bless America. Yes, God has blessed America. Yes, God is still blessing America, a land of diversity in every imaginable way. For in the Holy Qur'an Guidance to humanity, it states: "God has honored all of the children of Adam," and in America's Declaration of Independence, "all men are created equal." So with resources—material, spiritual, and mental—we thank You, God, for engineering the tradition of this land to witness that life and liberty must be secured by submitting our wills to Your plan.

Finally, we see the objective of life to nourish a world, a nation, a city, a neighborhood, a home, where the soul is at peace. The soul is not female or male, not rich or poor, nor African-American or Caucasian. As You have created us, aid us—really help us to struggle and realize, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven," as stated in Your guidance to humans in the Bible.

Help us use all our resources to preserve, maintain, and promote inherent freedom, not to be denied by the destiny of God until the world, Nation, city, neighborhood, and home cry out; one voice, one interest that life is sacred. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BEN NELSON led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, October 24, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN NELSON, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

### WELCOMING IMAM YUSUF SALEEM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before we move to the bill, I want to take a

minute and express the appreciation of the entire Senate, especially that of Majority Leader DASCHLE, for the groundbreaking prayer today. Imam Saleem appeared at our weekly prayer breakfast this morning at 8 o'clock.

Now for the first time in the history of this country, at least to my knowledge—I have been here awhile—we have had a Muslim offer our invocation. I not only was impressed with the content of the prayer but the manner in which it was delivered.

We should all feel so good about today. Dr. Ogilvie, who is present today, is to be commended for inviting one of his colleagues to be the guest Chaplain and allowing him to take his place. No one can take his place, but certainly he adequately represented him; that is for sure.

We are effusive in our praise for Dr. Ogilvie always but especially today for his insight into having Imam Saleem, the Resident Imam of Masjid Muhammad and also the National Educational Director for the Muslim American Society, with us. We are so grateful that he is here. We hope he returns and again blesses us with his prayer.

We have over 6 million of his faith in America. We have thousands of Muslims in Nevada. I hope some of them had the pleasure of watching today. For those who didn't, I will broadcast it every chance I get to make sure they do know he was here today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I know there are several Senators who wish to speak. I will quickly yield the floor.

While the Imam is still here, I join Senator REID in welcoming him to the Senate Chamber. Of course, I thank Dr. Ogilvie for making him available as a visiting Chaplain. It provides an example of the nature of the United States where we do not subscribe to one religion but have the advantage of many religions; the fact that our country has been stronger and better for that, that

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S10907

we make the Nation available to all religions and respect all religions and an individual's right to practice the religion they choose.

We were honored this morning by having the Imam here at the opening of our session. He demonstrated to our Nation that we are a diverse nation, diverse in our heritage. We are all either children or grandchildren or great grandchildren of immigrants, certainly in my family, my mother and my wife, first-generation Americans, speaking in a different language than English until they learned English. But we are also so different in all our religions. Look across the Senate floor. There are a number of different religions represented right here. We have Mormons, Protestants, Jews, and Catholics. It is a wonderful example of the diversity of this Nation. So I was pleased to hear Senator REID's comments. I associate myself with them. I thank the Imam for opening our session.

Mr. REID. Is the Senator from Vermont aware that this is the first time in the history of our country that a Muslim has offered the invocation for the Senate?

Mr. LEAHY. I was not aware of that. I certainly hope it will not be the last. I hope this will happen often. I also know that the visiting Chaplain honors us, but I also hope he knows the Senate honors him. My wife's brother is a Catholic priest. One of his great moments in his priesthood was when he opened the Senate session. He reminded us of that often. This is something we should do often, and I applaud the Chaplain in using his prerogative to make this opportunity available to so many others.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in welcoming the opening prayer this morning and say how much all of us appreciate this very important expression and how we value the message that was given to all of us today. I thank our leadership for giving us the opportunity to listen to this voice of peace and restraint and wisdom. I am personally very grateful to the guest Chaplain for his presentation.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate will resume consideration, under the direction of Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member MCCONNELL, of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. Rollcall votes on amendments to this bill are expected as the Senate works to complete action on this bill today. Hopefully by this afternoon sometime we can complete this most important piece of legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is prepared to lay down the bill. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 2506, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2506) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank both Senator LEAHY and Senator MCCONNELL for their work. I will have a number of amendments. Senator KENNEDY wants to speak briefly, and I ask my colleague from Illinois whether he also wants to speak.

Mr. DURBIN. Not at this point.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I follow Senator KENNEDY and be able to lay down the first amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

#### THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, since September 11, the courageous acts of countless Americans have set a new standard for the Nation. As the whole world watched the horror on television, it also witnessed what is best in our country and our character. As buildings collapsed, the American spirit soared.

The indelible images of the first days will live on in all the days of our history. Firefighters and police risked their lives and gave their lives to save others, and hundreds of rescuers paid the ultimate price. The brave passengers of flight 93 fought and defied the terrorists, and in the face of their own inevitable death, they prevented the killing of so many others.

Construction and health workers went into the shadow of constant danger to search for the missing and help the survivors. The mayor of New York City went everywhere sustaining the city. New Yorkers lined up for blocks to give blood, and so did thousands more across the country. Hundreds of millions of dollars poured in for the families of the victims, as valiantly, tearfully, and quietly they said goodbye to a mother, father, son, daughter, or friend in funeral after funeral.

And through it all Americans have begun to think deeply about our coun-

try again. We have a new sense of the precious nature of our freedom which, in the years after the cold war, we have increasingly taken for granted. We have learned anew to prize the experiment called America—a nation based not on sameness, but on diversity—a nation of different races, backgrounds, and faiths, defined not by an accident of geography or history, but by the high aspirations for a better life and greater opportunity that brought so many millions to these shores from every continent and country on the Earth.

Now, we have seen, perhaps more clearly than ever before in our lives, how we are all in this together—how, if even one of us is hurting all of us hurt. Our first thoughts on September 11 were about others, not ourselves.

That spirit must now live on. It is the new standard by which we must measure everything we do.

Today, brave young Americans are on the front lines of the fight for freedom from fear. Here at home, we must stand together to face and defeat the terrorists who would poison our people, panic our society, and paralyze our democracy. An essential point of protecting our homefront is protecting our economy—because the state of our Union cannot be strong, if the state of our economy is weak.

We need to speak honestly and directly about the choices we face—and we need to do so in the same spirit which has rallied Americans since September 11. The standard is clear—to seek what is right for our country, and not just for ourselves; not to strive for private advantage in a time of national need. And that standard should be bipartisan—not the false bipartisanship of merely going along, but true bipartisanship, which is a two-way street, where we genuinely seek and respectfully debate what course is best for our economy, for rebuilding and restoring, and especially for all those who have been hurt in the downturn. As President Bush eloquently said when he spoke to the Congress, “We will come together to strengthen America’s economy, and put our people back to work.” Now all of us, in both parties, in both Congress and the administration, must live up to that all important responsibility.

Fundamentally, this, too, is a question of national security. For a strong economy is the basis of a strong Nation. It assures opportunity for all. It is the foundation of a decent and free society at home, without which we cannot fight for decent and free societies abroad.

Before September 11, the Nation’s economy was already weakening. The unemployment rate had been climbing for months. Relatively few new jobs were being created. Companies were announcing successive rounds of layoffs. Business investment was being drastically reduced, and profits were rapidly falling.

Many economists believed we were in a recession, or that a recession was inevitable. And then came September 11, which was an attack not just on our cities and citizens, but on the entire American economy. No one can truly weigh the loss of life. But the loss of property amounts to tens of billions of dollars. We can redress that, and we will. But the loss and the risk went far beyond Ground Zero—in New York or at the Pentagon.

Americans stopped flying and stopped buying. Corporations put investment decisions on hold. Hundreds of thousands lost their jobs in companies across the economy, from airlines and hotels, to restaurants, retailers, and manufacturers of high-technology equipment.

Never before has it been so clear how inter-connected our society is. Two buildings go down tragically in New York City, and the entire economy suffers across the land. Economic models do not account for this. The most important of all our resources, our national confidence, has been more damaged than anyone initially realized.

It is crucial to recognize that once underway, a recession has no clear bottom. Unless we respond, it can spiral downward out of control, raising unemployment to higher and higher levels, and sharply reducing the flow of revenues for both government and business.

Consider this: Americans on average were saving very little of their income before September 11. If they now increase their savings by only 1 percent because they are afraid to spend, they will withdraw more than \$100 billion from the economy. It is not enough just to tell people to go out and spend and live normal lives. This is an extraordinary time—and we cannot talk the economy out of recession. Congress must act.

This week, as the Senate and the House continue the very important debate on what must be done to revive our economy, there is at least one overriding principle on which Republicans and Democrats both agree: Urgent action is required.

We all know that cutting interest rates is the first line of defense in a downturn. But we also know that in this time of clear and present danger, lower interest rates alone cannot reverse the decline in confidence, consumer spending, and business investment. Consumers and companies will not buy more and invest more in a time of great uncertainty simply because borrowing costs are lower.

We need a direct and sizable injection of resources by government to stimulate the economy.

But if we do this in the wrong way, a stimulus package could actually harm the economy. Some would rely almost exclusively on permanent tax cuts that will do little or nothing to promote growth when we need it most—which is right now. Their proposals are neither fair nor will they work. They do not measure up to the new and honest

standard of this time. A true stimulus package cannot be a disguise for special interests.

Nor can it run the risk of imposing large new long-term deficits on the Federal budget. Permanent new tax cuts—on top of nearly \$2 trillion in tax cuts enacted earlier this year—would actually hurt the economy by increasing the cost of long-term borrowing. Such cuts would deter the kind of business investments we need most.

Instead, a true economic stimulus program for our time must meet three criteria:

First, it must have an immediate impact on the economy. Every dollar of the stimulus package must be spent in the economy as soon as possible. The best way to accomplish this goal is to target the dollars to the low- and moderate-income families who are most certain to spend, rather than save it. When it is spent, its impact will be multiplied as it flows from consumers to business and back to workers. In fact, every dollar given to unemployed workers in unemployment insurance payments expands the economy by \$2.15.

Second, all the tax cuts and spending provisions in the plan must be temporary. They must focus on the immediate need to generate economic activity. They must not impose substantial new long-term costs on the Federal budget.

Third, the package must be fair and compassionate. It must focus on those who need and deserve the help, who are suffering the most in these difficult days. It must reflect the renewed spirit of taking care of each other. Let us here in Congress set a standard for our work equal to that set by so many after September 11. Leave no American behind—no victim of the terrorist attack, and no victim of its economic aftershocks.

The House Republicans have proposed a stimulus package that fails all three of these criteria. Sadly, this House Ways and Means Committee proposal does not rise to the higher standard required in this time of national crisis. It fails the economy. It merely repackages old, partisan, unfair, permanent tax breaks, which were rejected by Congress last spring, under the new label of economic stimulus. The American people deserve better.

The long-term cost of the House plan is much too high. More than half of the dollars would not even reach the economy for more than a year. The stimulus is needed now—not in 2003, 2004, or later. The House package spends \$46 billion on permanent new tax breaks for multinational corporations and large businesses. It gives many large businesses a \$25 billion windfall, not only by permanently repealing the corporate minimum tax, but also by refunding the minimum taxes already paid by them over the past 15 years. It also permanently reduces the tax on capital gains. It provides \$60 billion in permanent new tax cuts for upper in-

come taxpayers—only a small percentage of which would even go into the economy in the next year.

The wealthy individuals and big businesses that would receive these tax breaks will not spend most of the windfall. They will save it. Corporations will not invest more unless business itself improves. We cannot afford to waste valuable Federal dollars in ways that will not have a full and immediate impact on economic growth.

The House package also runs a grave risk of frightening financial markets and driving long-term interest rates up, because investors will expect future federal deficits to rise as a result of additional, permanent and unaffordable tax cuts. Already, mortgage rates have stayed stubbornly high in response to the tax bill passed earlier this year.

The House proposal is plainly unfair. In contrast to more than \$115 billion in permanent new tax cuts for wealthy individuals and corporations, it provides less than \$14 billion in tax cuts for lower and moderate-income families. While the tax cuts for these corporations and wealthy individuals are permanent, the cuts for working families are limited to just one year.

After passing nearly \$2 trillion in tax cuts heavily slanted to the richest taxpayers 4 months ago, it is wrong to give the wealthy still more tax breaks when there is a better, more effective way to move the economy. It makes no sense to offer indiscriminate long-term tax breaks, when what is needed are realistic incentives to invest now. And, if this Congress chooses to violate that basic stimulus principle, it would be grossly irresponsible and grossly unfair not to include the fair increase in the minimum wage that has been delayed for too long already.

The new standard set by September 11 calls for a new course of action—one that places national need above personal interests, one that will truly stimulate our economy. We need a Government stimulus package of \$71 billion, a package of targeted and effective support for middle and lower income working families that would be immediate, temporary, and fair, and that should include the following essential steps:

We must immediately extend unemployment insurance coverage an additional 13 weeks. The unemployed are on the front line of the economic battle, and they will spend their money immediately.

We must also extend unemployment insurance coverage to part-time and low-wage workers, who often do not qualify for any benefits at all, and who can least afford to lose their wages.

We must raise unemployment benefits by 15 percent for all workers. An average payment of \$230 a week is not enough.

We must add \$2 billion to job training programs to help workers prepare for and find new jobs.

These changes will cost \$18 billion, but an economy returning to prosperity will more than repay the expense.

We must protect health insurance for working families by having the Federal Government cover 75 percent of the cost of insurance premiums for 12 months after a worker loses a job. We must also support coverage for workers who do not qualify for such a plan. We know that when workers lose their jobs, they lose their health insurance, too.

This program would provide an additional \$17 billion of stimulus that will help keep the health care sector strong while keeping our workers healthy.

These elements—unemployment insurance, job training and health coverage for workers between jobs—are essential to any economic stimulus plan, which is why Senator BAUCUS and I have come together to propose these key changes to help workers get their feet back on the ground.

In addition to the Baucus proposal, an economic stimulus plan must add \$5 billion to help our communities: \$2 billion to food stamps and WIC, \$1 billion to heating assistance for families, and additional funds for expanded community service and opportunities for voluntarism.

We must also invest more now in the public works that will expand employment and stimulate the economy. As we make public buildings, airports, and our water supply more secure, we must also build and modernize schools, rail lines, and infrastructure. I propose a new, \$10 billion investment for these vital national purposes: \$3 billion for highways and bridges; \$3 billion for drinking water and wastewater treatment systems; \$3 billion for school safety and construction; and \$1 billion for our railways and mass transit systems.

In addition, it will not do much good to spend more at the Federal level if there are significant cutbacks at the State and local level. We do not want State and local governments, most of which have annual balanced budget requirements, to be forced to either raise taxes or cut essential services. Any such steps would be counterproductive at this critical time.

We are seeing State cuts in Medicaid, child care, job training, education, and transportation. Tennessee officials have proposed cuts that could cause 180,000 people to lose health insurance. Florida is debating a reduction in coverage for its medically needy population under Medicaid. Mississippi, Ohio, and South Carolina have already cut spending across the board. Other States are convening special sessions of their legislatures to address the crisis in their State budgets.

All this is hurting the very people who need help the most today—working families, single parents, poor children. And such cutbacks will clearly undermine the effects of any stimulus package.

The answer is for the Federal Government to provide an additional \$7 billion in the stimulus package to help the States to continue their existing human services programs. The most timely and effective way to accomplish this goal is to temporarily increase the Federal contribution to programs where there is already a State-Federal partnership. The largest of these is Medicaid. In a recession, the number of families eligible for Medicaid increases substantially. In fact, some estimate that if unemployment rises 2 percent, the number of Medicaid recipients could increase by 2.5 million, dramatically increasing State costs.

We should temporarily enhance the Federal matching rate for Medicaid by 2 percentage points for States that agree to maintain their current eligibility standards and benefits. This would serve as an incentive for those States.

We should also help States temporarily by increasing the Federal Social Services Block Grant Program, which is used by States to pay for a variety of services to low-income families. It is important that State governments not be forced to curtail assistance when it is needed most—and, once again, these are dollars that will also go directly and quickly into the economy.

This spending will lift the economy in the short term; and strengthen it for the long-term.

A stimulus package must also include the right kind of temporary tax cuts that actually increase spending and growth. Seventy percent of Americans pay more in payroll taxes than in income taxes. Yet many of them received no tax rebate earlier this year. The rebate unfairly ignored these low- and moderate-income families. A one-time rebate of payroll taxes would immediately inject \$15 billion into the economy, placing the dollars into the hands of people who will spend it immediately.

I do not see how anyone can defend permanent tax cuts over the next 10 years that primarily benefit the wealthy who will save most of the money, when that same money can and should be used to cut taxes now for middle- and lower-income families who will spend the gains immediately.

In the days and weeks ahead, there will be debates and compromises. But surely we can fashion a comprehensive stimulus package that meets America's new high standard—injects needed funds into the faltering American economy as quickly as possible—and that is fair and just.

In this case, fairness is also the deepest practical wisdom—the way to get the economy back on its feet as soon as possible and without jeopardizing the foundations of our future prosperity.

It would be wrong in principle and wrong economically to pass a false stimulus package of unfair tax cuts that would go largely unspent, giving the largest benefits to the few, with limited benefits to consumption and

production, and long-term damage to fiscal and monetary stability. After September 11, we cannot afford businesses as usual, or the clever politics of repackaging previous goals as if they were a real response to the need for national renewal.

We need a real response and real results—now. But this stimulus is only a first step in a new and greater project—for our economy and our society.

Let us be frank. For a long time now, our first thoughts have too often been about ourselves, not others. In the process, we have neglected the future and some of our best ideals. It is time to change that, too.

Our wartime leaders have always understood that we cannot ask people to sacrifice and to fight abroad if we fail to fight for a more decent and more just society here at home.

Our leaders have always understood that the war front and the home front are really the same front. Never has this been more true than in this new kind of war against terrorism, fought both thousands of miles from our shores and in our own airports, our own mailrooms, and potentially in any American community.

In the late 1950s Dwight Eisenhower saw the relationship between our national security and education when he created the National Defense Act. He had the vision to invest in both—through support of local public schools, improvements in math, science and technical education as well as loans so that more people could go to college. President Eisenhower would have met the September 11 standard.

As he led the Nation through World War II, Franklin Roosevelt fought to make the home front stronger, too. He demanded progressive income taxes, defended unions, opposed discrimination, and created new partnerships with business. He would have met the September 11 standard.

Beyond the stimulus package, how can we meet that standard now?

America would not be the America it is today if our nation and our people had not dared again and again to reach higher across our history. Once more today, a new economy demands a new era of public purpose and progress.

The first priority is education. The information age requires an ever-more sophisticated work force. I commend President Bush for the new and effective attention he has given to higher standards in our schools. Now, we must get this bill. And this bill is only the beginning of our effort, not the end. We must do more and invest more to improve education and to secure for every person the chance to go as far as their talents can take them. Maximum opportunity for each is the only path to maximum prosperity for all, and maximum strength for America.

The next priority is health care. Before September 11, we needed a Patients' Bill of Rights to guarantee that medical decisions will be made by doctors, not accountants, and that people

will have access to the best treatments, not just the cheapest. Terrorism is no excuse for delay. We need a Patients' Bill of Rights just as much today as we did before September 11. I urge the Congress to pass it now, and the President to sign it. And I urge the President and Members of Congress to keep the promise we all have made to guarantee all our seniors access to affordable prescription drugs. They need that help now, just as much as they did before.

There is something we need now even more than we did then: We must strengthen our fragile public health infrastructure to deal with the clear and present dangers of chemical and biological attack. On Capitol Hill, we know the threat first hand; we must defeat it, and we will.

Today, Senators and Members of Congress have the best of the Nation's health care at our disposal. Imagine the millions who do not. Many Americans do not even know where to go to find a doctor's help immediately. We need an emergency health care system sufficient beyond doubt to meet the dangers we may face—not just tomorrow, but over the next decade.

The bioterrorist threat should remind us of an ideal too long denied in this country: Health care is a fundamental right, not just when a terrorist attacks, but when cancer or diabetes or any other disease strikes. We have made progress; we must keep moving forward; we must get there.

Finally, the new economy has produced vast new wealth and opportunities, and reduced poverty by 25 percent since 1993. But millions are still left behind, and working families have not gained their fair share of this new national wealth. So when prosperity returns, we must ensure that we can all advance together. We must open new doors for every American. We must help 21st century mothers and fathers cope with the stresses of choosing between the jobs they need and the children they love. We must make the workplace more flexible, so that workers cannot only provide for their families, but also care for them. We must also provide a more decent living to the Nation's caregivers, to teachers, nurses, and child care workers, who give so much, yet earn so little. We must make sure the new economy works for all Americans.

Some say we cannot fight for a safer society and a more just society at the same time. I say, we weaken ourselves abroad if we do not strengthen ourselves at home. We cannot defend democracy abroad unless we extend democracy at home. In America and Britain, World War II was accompanied and followed by a period of great reform and historic transformation in society. Now, in this time of crisis, we cannot settle for anything else.

The spirit of September 11 points the way. In that spirit, we must continue to care about each other, and fulfill the promise and opportunity of America for all our people.

This spirit of September 11 has compelled so many of our citizens to do more for our country, our communities and our fellow Americans. This time calls for active citizenship, whether by children getting involved in service learning programs at school or senior citizens signing up for the Retired Senior Volunteer Program. This Saturday is Make A Difference Day, sponsored by America's Promise and the Points of Light Foundation. All Americans should use this occasion to find new ways to make their own contribution.

We are one American community. September 11 proved that. Active citizenship will nourish that spirit and sustain us in the challenges ahead. So we must reject any attempt to misuse the terrorist threat as an excuse to deny or delay our obligations to teach our children well, to treat the sick, help the needy, and make the new economy a new foundation for a stronger family life and a higher standard of life for all our families.

We have heard such excuses for inaction in the past. We will hear them again in this crisis, that the war on terrorism will deplete our resources and delay our commitment to "a more perfect union." Always in the past, there were doubters in America. But always we kept faith with America's ideals, and came together to fight the hardest battles and respond to the greatest social needs. We mobilized our government and our whole Nation, wisely and well, to defeat our enemies and meet the demands of our best ideals.

It has never been more critical to do so than it is today.

Let us start with a stimulus package that truly lifts our economy. And then let us finish the great work we are in—which is not just to win a war, but to build a future of "liberty and justice for all."

So my message now is fundamental. We need not and we must not sacrifice the home front to the war front. They are one and the same. We are all in this together, as we always have been throughout our great history.

If we meet the new standard of September 11, no one will stand in our way, and many more will join us. And the heroes of that day will have left an undying legacy—a proud new chapter in annals of America's greatness.

Let us pledge our energies to this cause. Let us show, that as the battle goes on for a world free from fear, the work goes on to move America forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I honestly and sincerely say it is one of the best speeches I have heard on the floor of the Senate in the 11 years I have been here. It is very connected to values I hold dear. I think what Senator KENNEDY just said, especially if it

gets translated into our doing the work and passing this legislation, is so important. These times call on all of us to be our own best selves. I believe that is what the Senator's speech has called for us to do here, and for all Americans, we need each other as never before. We need each other as never before in relation to the physical security challenges, in relation to the uncertainty of the world, and we need each other as never before in terms of how we help one another to be strong in our own Nation.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for a marvelous speech.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I yield.

Mr. REID. I agree with the Senator. It is one of the finest speeches I have heard on the Senate floor. It covers areas that needed to be covered. It was an elaborate speech, very substantive. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, we have to make sure it translates into getting work done.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 1922

Mr. WELLSTONE. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 1922.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

(1) Afghanistan's neighbors should reopen their borders to allow for the safe passage of refugees, and the international community must be prepared to contribute to the economic costs incurred by the flight of desperate Afghan civilians;

(2) as the United States engages in military action in Afghanistan, it must work to deliver assistance, particularly through overland truck convoys, and safe humanitarian access to affected populations, in partnership with humanitarian agencies in quantities sufficient to alleviate a large scale humanitarian catastrophe; and

(3) the United States should contribute to efforts by the international community to provide long-term, sustainable reconstruction and development assistance for the people of Afghanistan, including efforts to protect the basic human rights of women and children.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank both my colleagues. I think there may be support for this amendment. I think there should be. I will not take a lot of time. Let me explain why I think it is so important the Senate go on record.

I will not spend a lot of time on statistics. There are 7.5 million people inside Afghanistan who are threatened

by famine or severe hunger as cold weather approaches. President Bush has made it crystal clear that our military action is not against ordinary Afghans; it is against terrorists and their supporters. Ordinary Afghans are among the poorest and most beleaguered people on the planet. They were our allies during the cold war.

By the way, this amendment I send to the desk with Senator BOXER, as well.

Yet right now, on present course, time is not neutral and time is not on our side, and, more importantly, time is not on the side of ordinary Afghans. There will be at least another 100,000 children who will starve to death. The winter months are approaching.

Even before the world focused on it as a sanctuary for Osama bin Laden and other terrorists, Afghanistan was on the brink of a humanitarian catastrophe, the site of the greatest crisis in hunger and refugee displacement in the world. Now the worsening situation on the ground is almost unimaginable. After four years of relentless drought, the worst in three decades, and the total failure of the Taliban government in administering the country, four million people have abandoned their homes in search of food in Pakistan, Iran, Tajikistan and elsewhere, while those left behind eat meals of locusts and animal fodder.

Mr. President, 7.5 million people inside the country are threatened by famine or severe hunger as cold weather approaches, according to the United Nations.

As President Bush made clear, we are waging a campaign against terrorists, not ordinary Afghans, who are some of the poorest and most beleaguered people on the planet and were our allies during the cold war.

Yet, the current military air strikes and the disintegration of security is worsening the humanitarian situation on the ground.

Aid organizations are increasingly concerned about their ability to deliver aid to Afghanistan while the United States continues its bombing campaign. Several aid organizations have been accidentally bombed by the U.S. in the last week. In addition to these accidental bombings, law and order are breaking down inside Afghanistan. Reports indicate that thieves have broken into several aid organization offices, beat up the Afghan staff and stolen vehicles, spare parts, and other equipment.

Warehouses of the International Red Cross in Kabul were bombed yesterday. The ICRC says that the warehouses were clearly marked white with a large red cross visible from the air. One worker was wounded and is now in stable condition. One warehouse suffered a direct hit, which destroyed tarpaulins, plastic sheeting, and blankets, while another containing food caught on fire and was partially destroyed. The Pentagon claimed responsibility for the bombing later in the day, adding that

they "regret any innocent casualties," and that the ICRC warehouses were part of a series of warehouses that the United States believed were used to store military equipment. "There are huge needs for the civilian population, and definitely it will hamper our operations," Robert Monin, head of the International Red Cross' Afghanistan delegation, said in Islamabad, Pakistan.

Another missile struck near a World Food Program warehouse in Afsotar, wounding one laborer. The missile struck as trucks were being loaded for an Oxfam convoy to the Hazarajat region, where winter will begin closing off the passes in the next two weeks. Loading was suspended and the warehouse remains closed today.

Last week, four U.N. workers for a demining operation were accidentally killed when a bomb struck their office in Kabul.

In response to the dangers threatening humanitarian operations, the Oxfam America president said, "It is now evident that we cannot, in reasonable safety, get food to hungry Afghan people. We've reached the point where it is simply unrealistic for us to do our job in Afghanistan. We've run out of food, the borders are closed, we can't reach our staff, and time's running out."

The World Food Program was feeding 3.8 million people a day in Afghanistan even before the bombing campaign began. These included 900,000 internally displaced people at camps. Although the U.S. military has dropped thousands of ready to eat meals, everyone agrees that only truck convoys can move sufficient food into Afghanistan before winter. As of last Friday, there were only two convoys confirmed to have gotten through. WFP announced that two more convoys since the bombing campaign started were nearing Kabul.

Complications and delays in delivering emergency food supplies to Afghanistan could cause rising death rates from starvation and illness as winter sets in. Many of the high mountain passes will be closed by mid-November due to 20-30 foot snows.

Aid agencies are falling behind in their efforts to deliver enough emergency relief to Afghans to avoid a large loss of life this winter. UNICEF estimates that, in addition to the total of 300,000 Afghan children who die of "preventable causes" each year, 100,000 more children might die this winter from hunger and disease.

The main reasons for this shortfall in aid are related to security concerns. Aid agencies have withdrawn their international staff, and local staff have attempted to continue the aid programs but have been subjected to intimidation, theft, and harassment. As the United States continues to pound Taliban targets, law and order in some cities is reportedly also breaking down. Truck drivers are unwilling to deliver supplies to some areas for fear of being

bombed by the United States, or being attacked by one faction or another. Taliban supporters have obstructed aid deliveries on some occasions.

Despite these nightmares, shipment of food and non-food emergency items arrive in Afghanistan daily—but the total shipped is only about one-half of what is needed. The situation is particularly urgent as some of the poorest and most needy areas will be cut-off from overland routes by mid-November. An estimated 600,000 people in the central highlands are dependent upon international food aid, and little is on hand for them now.

The food shortfall in Afghanistan may result in an increased flow of refugees to the borders. A flood of refugees to the border would present a different but also challenging set of problems. Clearly, as everyone has said, it is better for them to remain at home than flee to neighboring countries out of hunger.

There is no easy solution to this humanitarian crisis. It is complex and requires the international community to take urgent and imaginative action to boost the flow of food inside. The United States should take the lead in helping to devise aggressive and imaginative ways to expand the delivery of food. These could include the creation of humanitarian corridors, the use of existing commercial trading companies and air deliveries to airports that have not yet been bombed.

The establishment of humanitarian ground and air corridors should be considered for the secure transportation and distribution of emergency aid. The Administration should push to have some roads or air routes in areas of limited conflict be designated as protected humanitarian routes. Such possible ground and air corridors include Northern Alliance held territory along the border of Tajikistan, and Northern Alliance airfields which have not been bombed. These airfields could be used for a Berlin style airlift to get massive amounts of aid into the country quickly.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees estimates that 1.5 million additional Afghans could seek to flee the country in coming months due to the ongoing military conflict.

All six countries neighboring Afghanistan have closed their borders to refugees both on security grounds and citing an inability to economically provide for more refugees. Thousands have been trapped at borders with no food, shelter, water or medical care.

I am introducing a resolution today which addresses this crisis. The text of the resolution states the following:

Afghanistan's neighbors should reopen their borders to allow for the safe passage of refugees, and the international community must be prepared to contribute to the economic costs incurred by the flight of desperate Afghan civilians;

As the United States engages in military action in Afghanistan, it must

work to deliver assistance, particularly through overland truck convoys, and safe humanitarian access to affected populations, in partnership with humanitarian agencies in quantities sufficient to alleviate a large scale humanitarian catastrophe;

The United States should contribute to efforts by the international community to provide long-term, sustainable reconstruction and development assistance for the people of Afghanistan, including efforts to protect the basic human rights of women and children.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

There has been a lot of focus on airdrops. The truth of the matter is, airdrops from 50,000 feet—and I know the Presiding Officer was present during the committee hearing we had—are not all that effective. Basically, all of the United Nations, the nongovernment organization, people on the ground have all said that not even 1 percent of the people are helped this way. Secretary Powell and the administration know this. At the same time, the reality is we have to do a couple of different things. If we don't, there will be a lot of innocent people who will starve to death. That is a reality. That is not consistent with our values; that is not who we are.

Frankly, if I were to make a political national interest argument—which I am not comfortable making because I think values enough should dictate what we do—I would say absolutely the worst thing imaginable would be, in the next several weeks or months to come, for there to be a situation where the Bin Ladens of this world were able to use the pictures of starving children in Afghanistan against our country. We don't want that.

Colleagues, on present course, that is what will happen. Therefore, there are a number of things we can do. I will go to the wording of the amendment. One is, we need the highest level United States engagement to open the borders, especially the Pakistani border. The administration has spoken about this. It is extremely important. Right now there are lots of refugees amassed at the border who cannot get over. It is a humanitarian crisis.

By the way, probably more serious than the 1.5 million refugees we will have, given the dangerous situation for themselves and their loved ones, is the people left behind in Afghanistan. The people who do not try to cross the borders are the poorest of the Afghans. They are the elderly, the most infirm.

The second thing I mention today is we have to do a better job. Our Government has to do a better job of efficiently making sure the money we have committed—we have made a generous commitment—actually flows to the United Nations organizations and nongovernmental organizations that are delivering the food. It wasn't until last weekend that the first installment was made. That was \$10 million to the United Nations; yesterday, \$20 million

to the NGO. Some of this was held up by Osama bin Laden. We have to be much more efficient at making sure the money flows to the people who are on the ground to deliver the food.

The third point is we are just going to need a more imaginative response, more imaginative action.

There are a number of different proposals that have been made, and the resolution is broad and just says we need to make that commitment, for example, opening up humanitarian response corridors. The most effective way to get food to people is going to be over land, by truck convoy. We may need to do a better job of coordination vis-a-vis our military action to open up those corridors and make sure the trucks can move and the food can flow.

Another thing is we are probably going to need to take a very serious look at these different airstrips. Airstrips that are in low conflict areas, we have to make sure they are going to be maintained because we may need to do a Berlin-style airdrop and planes actually land and we then get the food to people, which can be very effective.

What I am saying today is that we need to put every bit as much effort into the humanitarian relief right now as to the military effort. Both are extremely important.

I will just read the wording of the amendment which basically calls on Afghanistan's neighbors to open their borders for safe passage and makes it clear we are going to help with the economic costs and the plight of desperate Afghan civilians.

Second, it makes the point that in partnership with humanitarian agencies we have to do everything we can to deliver the food assistance in the most imaginative and effective ways possible. And then third, it talks about the obvious contribution we will make with the international community in terms of long-term sustainable reconstruction development and assistance for the people of Afghanistan.

I have decided not to take a lot of time because I believe there will be support. The aid agencies are falling behind in their effort to provide the emergency relief. UNICEF estimates that in addition to the 300,000 Afghan children who die of preventable causes each year, 100,000 more children are going to die this winter as a result of hunger and disease. That is unacceptable. That is unconscionable.

So what this first amendment that I have introduced does is it puts the Senate on record with a strong statement that we understand the urgency of getting the humanitarian assistance to the innocent people of Afghanistan. Again, I think this is a powerful and important message for us to deliver. We cannot be silent about this. We cannot put the fact that many, many people could and will starve to death in parentheses. We can't do that.

Moreover, I think we can and should and must, as responsible lawmakers, make it crystal clear that there are

some things we know need to be done: opening the borders to people, making sure the money flows more efficiently from the United States to these relief organizations, and again find creative new ways of getting them the food. Airdrops alone from 50,000 feet are not going to do the job.

I think the administration knows this. I hope there will be yet an even stronger commitment. I believe this statement from the Senate is extremely important. That is why I introduced this first amendment.

Mr. President, I think what I am going to do in order to move things forward is I am going to move to the second amendment which deals with Uzbekistan. Basically, it is a reporting requirement that not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this act and then 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the following. This basically we want to get an accounting of how our money is used by the military there. This is a human rights amendment. I will explain it in a moment, after I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator asking unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Until both managers are on the floor, I will lay aside the first amendment and then we can deal with both of them. I think both amendments will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1923

Mr. WELLSTONE. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 1923.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

#### SEC. . UZBEKISTAN.

REPORTS.—Not later than three months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and then six months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees on the following:

(1) The defense articles, defense services, and financial assistance provided by the United States to Uzbekistan during the six-month period ending on the date of such report.

(2) The use during such period of defense articles and defense services provided by the United States by units of the Uzbek armed forces, border guards, Ministry of National Security, or Ministry of Internal Affairs.

(3) The extent to which any units referred to in paragraph (2) engaged in human rights violations, or violations of international law, during such period.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the request. May I inquire of the Senator how long he will be speaking?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from West Virginia, I am actually trying to help the managers move along. I think I will probably be able to do this in less than 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, would the Senator include my request that I follow his remarks with a statement of my own?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks regarding this amendment, the Senator from West Virginia have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator and I remove my reservation.

Mr. WELLSTONE. The reason I offer this amendment requiring a report to Congress with respect to our efforts in Uzbekistan is that prior to the tragedies of September 11, few of us knew anything about this central Asian country. Yet today Uzbekistan has become one of our most important allies in this battle against terrorism. In fact, it is one of only two states bordering Afghanistan which is willing to host overt U.S. military operations to find Osama bin Laden.

Although we should welcome the co-operation of Uzbekistan in our efforts, we cannot overlook what is happening in Uzbekistan itself. Since 1997, this Government has used the threat of terrorism to justify a total crackdown on independent, peaceful Muslims who pray at home, study the Koran in small groups, belong to peaceful Islamic organizations not registered with the state, or disseminate literature not approved by the state.

Colleagues, I am pointing to a real dilemma for us. On the one hand, we understand the need for support. On the other hand, it is terribly important that we not uncritically align ourselves with governments which torture citizens.

This amendment is an important one, and I want to be clear about what it does. First and foremost, it in no way limits our ability to cooperate with Uzbekistan. We need Uzbekistan in the fight against terrorism, and we must be able to fully cooperate with their Government in that fight. But given the reports of grave abuses against civilians in the name of fighting terrorism, we need to monitor the co-operation. That is what this amendment is about.

The amendment requires that not later than 3 months after its enactment the Secretary of State report to appropriate congressional committees on, No. 1, the defense articles, services, and financial assistance provided by the United States to Uzbekistan; No. 2, the use of such articles, services, and assistance by the Armed Forces there, border guards, Ministry of National Security, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and, No. 3, the extent to which any units of these groups engage in a pattern of human rights violations or

violations of international law during that period.

In his national address on September 20th, President Bush linked the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, IMU, to Osama bin Laden, suggesting the IMU may be a target of U.S. counterterrorism attacks. Last year, the United States included the IMU on its list of terrorist organizations. The Government of Uzbekistan has also targeted the IMU as part of its own counterterrorism efforts. But according to the most recent Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, the Government of Uzbekistan has responded to the threat of terrorism by arresting "hundreds of Islamic leaders and believers on questionable grounds." In short, it has used the issue of terrorism to justify a far broader crackdown on peaceful Muslims. It has branded "independent" Muslims as "extremists," and sentenced thousands of them to long prison terms without connecting them to the IMU or to any acts recognized as crimes under international law.

The Uzbek government has particularly targeted a group known as the Party of Liberation. This is an Islamic group that supports the re-establishment of an Islamic state by peaceful means. Membership in this group or even possession of one of its pamphlets is deemed grounds for arrest and is punishable by up to twenty years in prison. Even prayer draws suspicion and has been cited in court as evidence of subversive intent. According to Human Rights Watch, in one verdict condemning an alleged Party of Liberation member to 18 years in prison, the Judge declared: "He confessed that in 1996 he started to pray." Increasingly, police arrest relatives of those accused of belonging to an unregistered Islamic group. In April 1999, the President of Uzbekistan declared that fathers would be punished for the supposed wrongs of their sons, and brothers and often arrested together and even tortured in each other's presence.

According to the Human Rights Watch World Report for 2001, those arrested in Uzbekistan endure the worst torture. The Reports states: "In addition to hundreds of reports of beatings and numerous accounts of the use of electric shock, temporary suffocation, hanging by the ankles or wrists, removal of fingernails, and punctures with sharp objects, Human Rights Watch received credible reports in 2000 that police sodomized male detainees with bottles, raped them, and beat and burned them in the groin area. Male and female detainees were regularly threatened with rape. Police made such threats in particular against female detainees in the presence of male relatives to force the men to sign self-incriminating statements. Police also regularly threatened to murder detainees or their family members and to place minor children in orphanages." Human Rights Watch reports that police torture in Uzbekistan has resulted

in at least fifteen deaths in custody in the past two years alone.

According to our own Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2000, the government of Uzbekistan's "poor human rights record worsened, and the Government continued to commit numerous serious abuses." "There were credible reports that security force mistreatment resulted in the deaths of several citizens in custody. Police and the National Security Service tortured, beat, and harassed persons. The security forces arbitrarily arrested or detained pious Muslims and other citizens on false charges, frequently planting narcotics, weapons, or forbidden literature on them." "The Government continues to voice rhetorical support for human rights, but does not ensure these rights in practice."

Just listen to some of these accounts:

Thirty-year-old Komlidin Sattarov was arrested in February 2000 for alleged possession of Party of Liberation leaflets, following his elder brother's conviction for membership in the group. His defender summarized some of the young man's court testimony of his torture by police:

He stuck it out for the first one or two days, but then they used electric shock. . . . They put him in a chair and strapped electrodes to his hands, feet, and neck and gave him electric shock. He lost consciousness and then they did it again. He confessed to some of the charges. Then they began to beat him with truncheons, and he agreed to sign everything.

Prior to a July and August 2000 trial of seventeen men on charges of Wahabism, a form of Islam, the defendants were held by police and tortured over several months. Gafurjon Tohirov testified in court that he was tortured for more than 2 months, that officers had beaten him on the bottoms of his feet and that the white clothes he had been wearing—he had just returned from a pilgrimage to Mecca—were covered with blood. While beating another defendant, police allegedly concentrated their blows on the young man's already injured kidneys, due to which, according to one source, the defendant agreed to sign a confession. Another accused was allegedly burned with cigarettes and subsequently raped in custody; investigators also allegedly threatened to rape his wife if he refused to give a self-incriminating statement. Once transferred from custody of the National Security Service, SNB, to Tashkent police headquarters in January 2000, this defendant continued to be tortured. A state appointed lawyer allegedly requested medicine for him from his family on January 10, as well as dark trousers to replace his bloodied white ones. They man was kept incommunicado in the basement of police headquarters in Tashkent for sixty-eight days. Dismissing his and other defendants' detailed allegations of torture, a judge of the Tashkent City Court declared on the day of the verdict, "No one tortured them. There was no written complaint that they

were tortured. When they were asked, they couldn't name their torturers . . . [W]e consider their testimony [on torture] as having no grounds."

When brothers Oibek and Uigun Ruzmetov were arrested on charges of attempting to overthrow the government, on January 1, 1999, their parents were also arrested. Their father on the same day, their mother on January 5. Their mother recounted that she was held for one night in solitary confinement in the district police station, handcuffed naked and given no water. Then they showed her to her son Uigun:

They . . . stripped me naked . . . Twice they walked him by me. He looked so bad, he had been completely beaten up. I could only cry, I could not talk to him. They told him, "Your parents and your wife are also in prison. Your children are in an orphanage. If you don't sign these documents, we'll do something very bad to your wife." My son at his trial said that he was told they would rape his wife before his eyes if he did not confess.

Mr. President, these stories are incredible. We can not ignore them. To do so implies that in the war against terrorism, anything goes. That kind of attitude will only weaken our war on terrorism, not strengthen it. Eighty percent of the population of Uzbekistan is Muslim. To ignore Uzbek abuses could add fuel to the fire that this is not truly a war on terrorism, but is a war on Islam. We must ensure that anti-terrorism efforts are conducted in a manner that protects religious freedom and other human rights, and we must carefully monitor our cooperation with Uzbekistan to ensure that protection. The amendment I offer here today requiring a report to Congress on the extent to which any Uzbek units receiving US assistance engaged in human rights violations, or violations of international law, will remind the Uzbek government that although we welcome their cooperation, we are also watching them.

All I am saying is when you have a group of people in a country who, because of the practice of their faith, are being crushed in this way, and you have examples of torture and rape, to the extent that we are involved with such a country, we ought at least have a monitoring of how the money is spent.

I think I will send the statement to Senators because, frankly, it is so graphic, it is difficult to go over in great detail.

You are talking about a government that has been involved in widespread abuse of human rights. You are talking about a government that has systematically tortured its citizens. I think at a very minimum in our work with this government, we have to make sure there is a very rigorous reporting of how our money is spent in relation to the military.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be set aside to be accepted as modified.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the Senator's request?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, after both amendments are accepted, I will yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have looked at both amendments. They are certainly acceptable on this side of the aisle.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask whether we might have a voice vote on the amendments, as modified.

Mr. President, I ask for a voice vote on both amendments, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendments, as modified?

Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (No. 1923 and No. 1922) were agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the votes.

Mr. SANTORUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to remind colleagues, independent of the amendments, that I later on today will have a colloquy with Senator BROWNBACK dealing with the whole question of women and girls being forced into prostitution. We want to talk about appropriations for that. I will probably be joined by my colleague, Senator FEINGOLD, in some discussion about Plan Colombia. I want to talk about the number of trips I have taken to Colombia and what I have seen focusing on human rights and having a chance to speak on the human rights position; in particular, the work I have been able to do with a very powerful Jesuit priest, Francisco De Roux, and something I think we can learn from his wisdom.

I want to move those amendments along.

I want to say two other things very quickly.

Last week, we passed a resolution which I have been trying to make long enough so that it can be in the Capitol Hill Police Office thanking the Capitol Police for their work.

This may be gratuitous—my guess is that Senators are doing this all the time anyway—for which I apologize. I suggest to Senators when they are passing by the Capitol Police to be sure to thank them. I met, for example, a young officer today. He told Sheila and me that he has little children. He sees them 1 hour a day. He is working six 12-hour days. He says that is better than 17-hour days.

They are working under a lot of pressure. I want on the floor of the Senate to again thank them for their work. I appeal to Senators to go out of their way to thank them.

If you look at the Capitol Hill Police men and women, you can see a lot of exhaustion in their faces. I think we owe a real debt of gratitude to them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have spoken to the Senator from West Virginia. We have some amendments that are cleared.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished whip for the purpose that he is now requesting. I ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of his remarks and the action on amendments I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from West Virginia.

Senator MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY have every intention of moving this bill as quickly as possible. If Members have amendments, they had better bring them because the managers aren't going to wait around all day long for Members to bring amendments to the floor. After reasonable time goes by and Members haven't gone to amendments, we are going to move to third reading of this bill.

#### AMENDMENTS NOS. 1924 THROUGH 1939, EN BLOC

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senate to consider, en bloc, 15 amendments; that the amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc; that the consideration of these amendments appear separately in the RECORD; and that any statements or colloquies be printed in the RECORD.

These amendments have been reviewed very closely by the managers of the bill and their staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. MCCONNELL and others, proposes amendments numbered 1924 through 1939.

The amendments (Nos. 1924 through 1939) were agreed to, as follows:

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1924

(Purpose: To make available funds to assess the cause of the flooding along the Volta River in Accra, Ghana, and to make recommendations on how to solve the problem)

On page 125 line 16, before the period at the end of the line insert the following: "Provided further, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading, up to \$100,000 should be made available for an assessment of the causes of the flooding along the Volta River in Accra, Ghana, and to make recommendations for solving the problem".

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1925

On page 133, line 17, after "States" insert the following: ", of which not to exceed \$28,000,000 shall be available for the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying direct loans and guarantees for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia".

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1926

On page 229, line 12, after "steps" insert the following: ", additional to those undertaken in fiscal year 2001,".

On page 229, line 16, strike everything after "(3)" through "law" on line 17, and insert in

lieu thereof: "taking steps, additional to those undertaken in fiscal year 2001, to implement policies which reflect a respect for minority rights and the rule of law, including the release of all political prisoners from Serbian jails and prisons".

## AMENDMENT NO. 1927

On page 176, line 15, strike "\$14,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,500,000".

## AMENDMENT NO. 1928

At the appropriate place, insert:

## DISABILITY ACCESS

SEC. . Housing that is constructed with funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and to carry out the provisions of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989, shall to the maximum extent feasible, be wheelchair accessible.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1929

On page 142, line 18, after "That", insert the following: "of the amount appropriated under this heading, not less than \$101,000,000 shall be made available for Bolivia, and not less than \$35,000,000 shall be made available for Ecuador: *Provided further*, That".

On page 142, line 25, strike everything after "with" through "General" on page 143, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof: "the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention".

On page 143, line 6, strike "according to the" and insert in lieu thereof: "in accordance with Colombian laws and regulations, and".

On page 143, line 10, strike "in place" and insert in lieu thereof: "being utilized".

On page 143, line 12, after "and" insert: "to".

On page 216, line 14, strike "concerning" and insert in lieu thereof: ", including the identity of the person suspended and".

## AMENDMENT NO. 1930

On page 127, line 12, strike everything after "rehabilitation" through "Maluka" on line 13, and insert in lieu thereof: "and reconstruction, political reconciliation, and related activities in Aceh, Papua, West Timor, and the Maluku".

On page 220, line 23, after "Indonesia" insert the following: ", including imposing just punishment for those involved in the murders of American citizen Carlos Caceres and two other United Nations humanitarian workers in West Timor on September 6, 2000".

On page 221, lines 17 and 18, strike "having in place a functioning system for".

On page 221, lines 19 and 20, strike "that fund activities".

## AMENDMENT NO. 1931

On page 128, line 9, insert the following:

## LAOS

Of the funds appropriated under the headings "Child Survival and Health Programs Fund" and "Development Assistance", \$5,000,000 should be made available for Laos: *Provided*, That funds made available in the previous proviso should be made available only through nongovernmental organizations.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1932

On page 127, line 19, strike "should" and insert in lieu thereof "shall".

## AMENDMENT NO. 1933

(Purpose: To prohibit humanitarian assistance inside Burma unless certain conditions are met)

On page 127, line 26, after "law:" insert the following: "*Provided further*, that none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to provide humanitarian assistance inside Burma by any individual, group, or association unless the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the provision of such assistance includes the direct involvement of the democratically elected National League for Democracy".

## AMENDMENT NO. 1934

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

## COMMUNITY-BASED POLICE ASSISTANCE

SEC. . (a) AUTHORITY.—Funds made available to carry out the provisions of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used, notwithstanding section 660 of that Act, to enhance the effectiveness and accountability of civilian police authority in Jamaica through training and technical assistance in internationally recognized human rights, the rule of law, strategic planning, and through the promotion of civilian police roles that support democratic governance including programs to prevent conflict and foster improved police relations with the communities they serve.

(b) REPORT.—Twelve months after the initial obligation of funds for Jamaica for activities authorized under subsection (a), the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees describing the progress the program is making toward improving police relations with the communities they serve and institutionalizing an effective community-based police program.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—Assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1935

On page 179, line 7, after "democracy" insert ", human rights".

On page 179, line 8 after "which" insert: "not less than \$5,000,000 should be made available for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund of the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Department of State, for such activities, and of which".

## AMENDMENT NO. 1936

At the appropriate place, insert:

## SEC. . SEPTEMBER 11 DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS PROGRAMS.

Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Economic Support Fund", not less than \$15,000,000 shall be made available for programs and activities to foster democracy, human rights, press freedoms, and the rule of law in countries with a significant Muslim population, and where such programs and activities would be important to United States efforts to respond to, deter, or prevent acts of international terrorism: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this section should support new initiatives or bolster ongoing programs and activities in those countries: *Provided further*, That not less than \$2,000,000 of such funds shall be made available for programs and activities that train emerging Afghan women leaders in civil society development and democracy building: *Provided further*, That not less than \$10,000,000 of such funds shall be made avail-

able for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund of the Bureau of Democracy Human Rights and Labor, Department of State, for such activities: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the authority of this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1937

At the appropriate place in the bill insert:

## SEC. . UZBEKISTAN.

REPORTS.—Not later than three months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and six months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees describing the following:

(1) The defense articles, defense services, and financial assistance provided by the United States to Uzbekistan during the six-month period ending on the date of such report.

(2) The use during such period of defense articles and defense services provided by the United States by units of the Uzbek armed forces, border guards, Ministry of National Security, or Ministry of Internal Affairs.

(3) The extent to which any units referred to in paragraph (2) engaged in human rights violations, or violations of international law, during such period.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1938

At the appropriate place, insert:

## SEC. . HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHANISTAN.

It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) Afghanistan's neighbors should reopen their borders to allow for the safe passage of refugees, and the international community must be prepared to contribute to the economic costs incurred by the flight of desperate Afghan civilians;

(2) as the United States engages in military action in Afghanistan, it must work to deliver assistance, particularly through overland truck convoys, and safe humanitarian access to affected populations, in partnership with humanitarian agencies in quantities sufficient to alleviate a large scale humanitarian catastrophe; and

(3) the United States should contribute to efforts by the international community to provide long-term, sustainable reconstruction and development assistance for the people of Afghanistan, including efforts to protect the basic human rights of women and children.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1939

On page 153 line 7, after the colon insert the following: "*Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated by this paragraph, not less than \$2,300,000 shall be made available for assistance for Thailand:"

## AMENDMENT NO. 1926

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I offer this amendment along with Senators HELMS and LEAHY out of concern with the continued detention of political prisoners in Serb jails. Our amendment is simple and straightforward: It makes absolutely clear that among the certification requirements contained in section 575 of this bill is the release of these prisoners. I urge the democrats and reformers in Belgrade to take notice of our actions, and to release the political prisoners immediately. I yield the floor to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I find it incomprehensible for a government that claims to

be democratic and just to sustain this cruel vestige of the Milosevic era.

Last August, I asked my staff to travel to Serbia and visit these Albanian political prisoners. My intent was the following: I wanted to check on the physical conditions of these prisoners. I wanted to ensure that they and their families know the United States has not forgotten about their suffering. I wanted to underscore to authorities in Belgrade that they must release these political prisoners who were arrested, too often brutally tortured, sentenced and jailed by Milosevic and his system of kangaroo justice. And, I wanted to remind Belgrade that failure to do so will have consequences for their relationship with the United States.

Serbian Justice Minister Batic cooperatively arranged meetings for my staff. These took place in two Serbian jails with four Kosovar Albanian prisoners: Kurti Aljbin, Isljam Taci, Berisa Petrit, and Sulejman Bitici. These four individuals, I might add, were chosen at the recommendation of an extremely courageous woman, Natasa Kandic of the Humanitarian Law Center in Yugoslavia. Ms. Kandic is Serb, who at great risk to her personal safety, has provided these and other Albanian political prisoners legal and humanitarian assistance.

The stories of these four political prisoners speak volumes to the atrocities and injustice of the Milosevic regime. Imagine being arrested because you are an Albanian student, thrown in jail only to learn later that there were no formal charges brought against you, and even if there were you couldn't appeal them because your file had "disappeared" or it was burned. Imagine being thrown out of a fourth story window so that your legs would break, or being subjected to repeated beatings, shock torture, and mock executions. That is exactly what happened during the Milosevic era.

The good news is that these tortures have ended. However, ending the torture is not enough. Each day Belgrade keeps people like Kurti Aljbin, Isljam Taci, Berisa Petrit, and Sulejman Bitici locked behind bars is another day that Belgrade has continued the horrors and injustice of the Milosevic regime. And this is totally unacceptable.

One prisoner asked the poignant question: "If Milosevic is in jail, why are we still here?" The fact is there is no justifiable answer to this question. I yield the floor to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. It has been almost a year since the fall of Milosevic, and more than five months have passed since his arrest. While some Albanian prisoners were released earlier this year, there are still more than 100 Albanian political prisoners languishing in Serb jails. There is no justification under any circumstances, to imprison innocent people. Serb officials know this. These people should never have been arrested, and they should have been released long ago.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the Senator yield for an additional comment? I continue to be keenly interested in the investigation into the murder of the three American brothers of Albanian descent from New York who were recently found in a mass grave in Serbia. Justice must be served for their murders, which occurred at the end of the war in Kosova.

Mr. LEAHY. I urge adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized under the previous order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

I also congratulate and thank Senator KENNEDY who spoke earlier for the proposals and suggestions, and the good counsel that he offered to the Senate at this critical time.

#### REMAINING A SENSE OF SECURITY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this morning the U.S. Postmaster General warned Americans that their mail is not guaranteed to be safe.

The American people have been on an emotional roller coaster ride ever since September 11. In the days and weeks following the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the American people collectively have experienced a national anxiety attack—fear, remorse, outrage, despair, confusion, depression, and unease have all manifested themselves in recent weeks.

Before the brutal terrorist attacks of September 11, American consumers were already nervous as layoff announcements rolled out of auto factories, and stock market retirement savings dissipated into thin air. Since that dark day, the economy has grown even more unstable as consumers, seized with fear—Franklin D. Roosevelt said, there is nothing for us to fear but fear itself, but fear is here, and it permeates throughout this city and throughout the Nation—consumers, seized with fear, have stayed riveted to their television sets and away from shopping malls.

American consumers have postponed taking that much-deserved family vacation out of fear of getting onto an airplane. I would share that same fear. I know it is all right for some to say, go ahead and ride an airplane if you have the Secret Service there to protect you and you can go on a special plane, but I would not ride on a commercial plane right now because I share that fear. Consumers are shunning restaurants, avoiding movie theaters and other public gathering places which they fear might be the target of new terrorist attacks.

Although the initial shock has begun to wear off, and economic activity has recovered somewhat from the weeks immediately following the terrorist attacks, nearly 200,000 Americans lost their jobs last month—the largest

monthly decline since February 1991, more than 10 years ago—and the unemployment rate is expected to soar to well over 5 percent in this month alone. This on top of the fear that has kept people away from the streets of Washington.

Just a few days ago, I recall, Metro was offering free tickets to people in the suburban areas in an attempt to entice them to come into the city of Washington and go to the restaurants and go to the stores. And the restaurants were offering free food in some instances or a free glass of wine to encourage people to come into this city, the Capital City, which was burned by the—I hope the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will wait just a moment. I want to mention something he will remember.

This Capitol was burned during the War of 1812 by the British. It is practically empty now. The Senator from Massachusetts will remember, with me, something that was occurring in this city 39 years ago right now. I was here on October 22, 1962—1962 or 1963?

Mr. KENNEDY. It was 1962.

Mr. BYRD. The late President John F. Kennedy delivered an ultimatum to the then-leaders of the Soviet Union to get their missiles out of Cuba. That was on Monday of this week, 39 years ago. We Senators then felt the same angst that we do now.

The President, in a television address, delivered this ultimatum. President Kennedy also suggested that there be regional meetings where we Members of Congress—I was a Member of the Senate—could go to regional meetings and get briefings. The Senate was not in session. The Senate had gone out of session on the October 13 sine die. And the late President John F. Kennedy informed Members of Congress that he would give them notice to come into Washington if the necessity arose.

There was fear throughout the land. That was 39 years ago this week. On Sunday of this week 39 years ago Nikita Khrushchev capitulated to President Kennedy's demand that those missiles, be pulled out of Cuba.

President Kennedy instructed our naval ships to stop any ship that approached Cuba and to search that ship. And there was a ship that approached Cuba. I forget what flag it was flying, but our naval units stopped it, searched it; and when we finally determined that Nikita Khrushchev really meant what he said, that he would get those missiles out of Cuba, then we relaxed.

I had no intention of bringing my wife into this city during those days. They were very tense days. The people were not just thinking of anthrax; they were thinking of nuclear war. We had strong leadership—strong leadership—that laid it down to the Soviet leaders. Mr. Khrushchev, who had once beaten his shoe upon the desk and said: We will bury you—that was Khrushchev—he was soon relieved of his leadership

position in the Soviet Union. Mr. Brezhnev then became the First Secretary, and who Nikolai Bulganin who became the Premier of the Soviet Union. But those were the conditions 39 years ago right now in this city.

Well, fortunately, we are not facing what appeared to then be perhaps an immediate nuclear attack on this country. And some of the nuclear missiles could have emanated from Cuba. Here we are again now, and we have received a terrorist attack on the World Trade buildings in New York City and on the Pentagon. We are faced now with an even more subtle and sinister attack on the people in this city. As I said earlier, the Postmaster General indicated just this morning that the American people cannot be guaranteed their mail is safe.

I say to my wife—my wife of 64 years, I hasten to add—Don't you go to the mailbox. Leave the mail in that box until I come home. I will get the mail out of the box.

That is the kind of fear that is permeating this whole country, this whole city, this whole complex from which I speak today.

Our staffs are warned about the mail that comes to us from our constituents. It may be a letter, a package, something that was not sent by a constituent in our mail. So our staffs are in fear.

The unemployment rate is expected to soar to well over 5 percent in this month alone. The Congress will soon consider a stimulus plan. It is being discussed. Preparations for such a plan are going forward. I have had my Appropriations Committee staff working on a stimulus package, one that will include funds for homeland security, homeland defense. This stimulus plan is aimed at providing a shot in the arm to our flagging economy.

We hear a lot about business tax cuts. I have already voted against a gargantuan \$1.3 or \$1.6 or \$1.8 or \$2 trillion tax cut earlier this year. Now we hear that there are going to be further tax cuts. A measure is making its way in the House of Representatives, I understand, that would provide up to \$100 billion in tax cuts and almost \$200 billion, \$195 billion over 10 years. Business tax cuts, increased unemployment benefits, subsidized health insurance premiums are all on the table. But none of these—none of these—will help to assuage the psychology of fear that grips this land of ours.

The surest way to stabilize the economy and encourage Americans to get back on airplanes, to go back to the shopping malls, to go back to the automobile dealerships—look over those shiny automobiles, kick the tires, see if the windshield wiper works, raise the lid of the trunk—the way to get people back to those dealerships, the way to get people back to those neighborhood restaurants, the way to get people back to the movie theaters and to take their children is to take positive steps to address their fears, the fears of the Amer-

ican people about future terrorist attacks.

I might as well talk about this fear. We all know it is here. The distinguished Senator from Florida, who is a former astronaut, who presides over the Senate today with such a degree of skill and dignity, he knows this, he knows what we are talking about. The people at the desk here in front of us, this is no secret to them; they know what fear is. The pages know about it. Why not say it?

The best way to make our people feel safe again and to defeat the intentions of the terrorists is to go ahead with this stimulus package, certainly to move ahead with funding for homeland security in its many forms.

We can start by addressing our woefully inadequate border security; put more Immigration and Naturalization Service personnel on our borders; put more Customs agents on our borders; enhance this woefully inadequate border security. I doubt that many Americans find comfort in learning that the Immigration and Naturalization Service cannot account for how 6 of the 19 hijackers involved in the September 11 attacks got into the United States. Likewise, how much comfort do the American people find in knowing that the U.S. Customs Service—get this now—inspects only 2 percent of the cargo that enters the United States? We are wide open—wide open. And the terrorists have known that. As a matter of fact, we have been lucky not to have been hit many times prior to September 11.

We can reassure the American people that the Government of the United States is doing all it can to prepare for a biological or chemical act. The American people have learned firsthand in recent days that chemical and biological weapons are no longer the stuff of fiction but are real threats that can suddenly claim the lives of American citizens. We must train our doctors and nurses to diagnose and care for victims of bioterrorism as well as to contain any possible resulting outbreak.

We must expand our Nation's reserve of vaccines and antibiotics, and we must provide our local health departments, in Beckley, WV, Parkersburg, Clarksburg, Martinsburg, in cities all throughout this land, in towns all throughout this land, in hamlets all throughout this land, provide our local health departments, so many of which are in rural isolated areas, with access to the Nation's computerized networks of medical response information.

Our Nation's transportation network faces a similar daunting upgrade. In the days immediately following the September 11 attacks, airport security was improved, but much remains to be done. New scanning equipment must be built and installed as quickly as possible. Better trained inspectors must be hired. Security enhancements must be made at our Nation's airports, and the same case must be made for improve-

ments to our roads and bridges, our railroads, our water and sewer systems, our law enforcement capabilities that have suffered due to years of neglect. Hear me now! Due to years of neglect, we have allowed our infrastructure to become antiquated! With the threat of further violence on American soil, everything from dams and reservoirs and locks and dams to nuclear powerplants to the method of transporting the Nation's food supply, we need to beef up the inspections of our meat, our poultry, our imported food—all these things must be examined in terms of their potential vulnerability. By renewing our commitment to investments in our own country, we can help to mend the holes in America's homeland security.

Mr. President, the American people are looking to the Congress for reassurance. The American people want to know that their representatives understand their fears—the people's fears—and the people's uncertainties. They want to know that the men and women in this legislative branch—the Senate and the House—understand these things and are taking steps to deal with potential threats.

Partisan disputes breed uncertainty in our financial markets and in our economy. All of us ought to be ashamed of the slowness with which we have dealt with the appropriations bills. They are ready. We have completed conferences on and we have acted upon the conference reports on 2 bills—2 out of 13 bills. And here we are. We have had two continuing resolutions, and we are now somewhat in the midst of the time allotted by the second continuing resolution. We have instead been arguing over other things—things that didn't have anything to do, as far as I am concerned, with getting on with the appropriations bills.

Partisanship. Partisanship must no longer reign over this Senate or over the House of Representatives—at least until we get our appropriations bills completed. And we had better be busy about that. We should allow the President 10 days after we send him the last appropriations bill. He should be allowed 10 days in which to sign the last appropriations bill or to veto it. He should not be given the opportunity to pocket veto an appropriations bill. We need to be busy about the people's business.

The American people want to regain that sense of security that they lost on September 11. They want to get on an airplane without worrying about hijackers. They want to go to work free of angst about every piece of mail that comes into the office. Those who go to movies want to relax while they are there, and they are entitled to that. Those who go to the shopping malls want to relax without looking over their shoulders, as it were. Unless we take—when I say “we,” I mean us folks—unless we take immediate and serious steps to address these fears, all of the rhetoric about normalcy is just plain old hot air.

This Government's most basic responsibility is to take all—not just a few but all—feasible steps to protect its citizens. The conflict is not just in the steep mountains of the Himalayas in Afghanistan. I was there 46 years ago. Let me tell you folks, you have seen the Rockies. Go to the Himalayas; spend some time in Afghanistan. The winter is coming on, and soon. And there are millions of landmines waiting on a footstep.

The conflict is not just in the mountains of Afghanistan. Our people are at risk on our own soil. Congress, therefore, must act now to ensure the security of the Nation and the American people. By investing in measures that strengthen our ability to guard our citizens right here at home, we can take an important step toward removing the paralysis—the paralysis—go look that word up in the dictionary, and if you haven't noticed it before, you will see it—the paralysis of fear. Look at our empty office buildings on Jenkins Hill right here.

We can take an important step toward removing the paralysis that results from living in fear. This should be our mission in the days ahead as we craft a stimulus package. Whether or not we craft a stimulus package, we have 11 appropriations bills awaiting action here in one form or another. They will be coming along in conference reports. There are appropriations bills such as the one before the Senate now that will be up for action in this body. So let's get busy about our work. This should be our mission in the days ahead as we craft a stimulus package that can restore confidence, which is the backbone of a strong economy.

Mr. President, I thank all Senators and I yield.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I rise to speak about an amendment to the foreign operations bill. I understand it has been accepted. It deals with funding for leadership training for Afghan women. I think this is an important amendment. Even though it is not a great deal of money that is involved, I think it is important for us to do.

The proposed amendment funds a specially created training program for Afghan women involving civil society development, democracy building, and leadership, at a cost of \$2 million. It is not a large amount of money, but if we can get women involved back in the Afghan society, it is an important amount of money.

This funding has two purposes. First, it helps talented but direly disenfranchised Afghan women to stra-

tegically participate in nation building. Second, this is a symbolic expression of support from the Congress for Afghan women under the present Taliban regime.

The American people are engaged in a war right now. It is a war against those who want to destroy our physical well-being, our peace of mind, and our way of life. It is a war against the Taliban, which continues to provide fertile soil and a shield for terrorists. It is not, however, a war against the Afghan people, as the President repeatedly stated and as Members of this body have stated. In fact, the Afghan people are the victims of the Taliban, and no one group has suffered more than the women.

We have all heard the horrible stories by now: How women are forced to hide behind closed doors, prisoners in their own homes, some even starving because there is no male relative to take them to market; how they are barred from schools and jobs and from desperately needed health care; how they are beaten in the streets if their ankles are showing; how they are beaten for begging, even though they are forbidden to work; how they are beaten for no reason at all; how they are continually silenced, hidden, and treated as less than human—all of this in the 21st century.

I am sure some of my colleagues and others recall the images on CNN of Afghan women fleeing Afghanistan into Pakistan dressed in burqas that completely cover them. All she has is a small mesh area through which to look and breathe. That is so dehumanizing, as if this is not a person; they are not recognized as a separate individual.

It has not always been like that in Afghanistan. That is important for us to know and remember as well. These same women who now hide with fear and are forced into these burqas once had a voice in their country. Some choose to wear a certain traditional garb, and that is wonderful, but they should not be forced to do it.

In Afghanistan, women once represented half the students, half the civil servants, and 40 percent of the doctors in Kabul were once women. Once they were valued members of their society, and they must become this again. To accomplish this, they will need our help and support, and we should give it.

I am pleased to offer this amendment with Senator BOXER. She and I helped pass a resolution 2 years ago condemning the Taliban regime. This amendment has been accepted by the managers of the bill. I am very pleased with that.

This amendment funds \$2 million for scholarships for Afghan women. There will be approximately 300 women selected to participate in training programs for emerging leaders. They will be instructed in civil society development, including effective governance, economic development, establishing nongovernmental organizations, and an

independent press, among other fundamentals of a free society, including the right to vote for all citizens in Afghanistan and human rights, including religious freedom for all citizens and people of Afghanistan.

The Afghan women will learn from top professors and experts in the field. Their curriculum will be developed in close consultation with Afghan women's groups on the ground in South Asia and in the United States. A selection of candidates will be made in close consultation with leading Afghan women in exile and leading Afghan women still in Afghanistan today, and United States embassies abroad.

I believe programs such as these can help play a key role in stabilizing the region and rebuilding the lives of its citizens. The United States is at its best when it stands up for our fundamental principles, and that includes the right to vote for everybody, the right of participation for everybody, democracy, freedom, religious freedom, and human rights.

This amendment can give the women who have far too long been victimized by the Taliban brutality the tools to rebuild a new Afghanistan on the foundation of democracy, tolerance, human rights, and equality.

Lastly, this funding not only helps Afghanistan; it also helps America. As Afghan women promote democratic values in their society, they inherently prevail over the forces of terrorism, extremism, and repression which have also victimized us.

I am pleased my colleagues have accepted this amendment, and I look forward to its implementation where we help Afghan women rebuild a civil society in their country. As we move forward in the prosecution of this war in Afghanistan, it is very important that our next step, once we are able to secure the country, is to rebuild a civil society with everybody participating.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to offer some comments on the bill before us, the foreign operations appropriations bill.

Today we are considering the fiscal year 2002 foreign operations appropriations bill. I ask my fellow Senators to consider this: The total foreign assistance spending in this legislation represents just .79 percent of the entire \$1.9 trillion Federal budget. That is less than half of what it was just 15 years ago, and it is barely .1 percent of GDP. An even smaller amount of the bill's funding is for foreign development assistance, less than .6 percent of the budget.

Anemic U.S. foreign assistance spending is not new news, but it is part of a very sad legacy of more than two decades of declining foreign assistance spending.

But at precisely the time when the events of September 11 have driven

home what an integrated and globalized world we live in, a world that requires us, I believe, to reexamine the basic underpinnings of U.S. national security policy, it is baffling that the United States remains on a course to tie a post-World War II low in foreign assistance spending and a 50-year low of overseas assistance as a share of Government spending.

I do not mean this as any criticism of the managers of the bill. Given the administration's request and the allocations of the subcommittee, they have done an excellent job of putting together a \$15.5 billion bill. But in light of September 11, I strongly believe that the fundamental assumptions regarding how best to safeguard U.S. national security interests over the long term require rethinking and reexamination.

As America undertakes a war on terrorism, we must declare war on global poverty as well, and we must do so because our national security demands no less.

If we are going to win this war against terrorism, we have to be willing to invest in the lives and livelihoods of the people of the developing world. For it is the poverty and the resulting political instability and institutional weakness of developing countries, many of them failed or near failed states, which provide the ecosystem in which terrorists, terrorist operations, terrorist recruitment, and terrorist organizations are able to flourish.

The World Bank estimates that 1.2 billion residents of poor nations live on less than \$1 a day. In South Asia alone, more than 550 million people, 40 percent of the total population, live on less than \$1 a day. In sub-Saharan Africa it is close to 50 percent of the population. I know the Chair is eminently familiar with this. Close to 50 percent of the population—that is, 291 million people, or more than the entire population of the United States—live in that abject, grinding poverty.

All in all, about 2.8 million people, half of the world's population, live in poverty, getting by on \$2 a day. That is less than a cappuccino at Starbucks.

The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations estimates that nearly 800 million people in the developing world are undernourished, 1.2 billion lack access to safe drinking water, 2.9 billion have inadequate access to sanitation, and over 1 billion people are either unemployed or underemployed.

For all too many of these people, there is precious little hope in their daily life, and they experience a world in which progress or betterment is virtually impossible.

Yet, as a recent Congressional Budget Office study on the role of foreign aid and development reports: "U.S. spending on foreign aid has fluctuated from year to year but has been on a downward path since the 1960s."

In 1962, the United States spent more than 3 percent of the budget outlays on

foreign assistance. Today, as I noted, it is barely six-tenths of 1 percent. This is unconscionable. Interestingly enough, people do not understand this. I often ask people: How much do you think the foreign operations budget is as a percent of the overall budget? Some will say 5 percent, some will say 10 percent, some will say 15 percent, but nobody says less than 1 percent.

Yet that is the fact. The United States spends less than \$30 a year for each of its citizens helping those in the developing world, compared with a median per capita contribution of \$70 by other industrialized nations. This has not always been the case and, I would argue, it is also not becoming of America's position and role in the world.

Between 1950 and 1968, the United States contributed more than half of the official development assistance provided by countries in the OECD Development Assistance Committee, and by 1978 we were contributing less than a third. By 1998, it was less than a sixth, where it languishes today.

Some would question why this matters, or they would argue that it is the responsibility of others, not us, to address these development needs.

The short answer is that it matters because development assistance is a critical tool for the protection and promotion of U.S. interests around the globe. It matters because poverty leads to financial instability, infectious disease, environmental degradation, illegal immigration, drugs, narcotic trafficking, and it fuels the hatred of "have-not" nations for the "have" nations, of which the United States heads the list.

Although not the sole cause of perceived grievances in an increasingly unequal and increasingly globalized world, poverty is a principal cause of human suffering, and the political instability that results as well.

In its worst form, poverty creates the political, social, economic, and institutional instability and chaos that leads to failed states, zones of anarchy, and lawlessness, with semi-legitimate governments, or no real functioning government, which are unable to offer their people a positive vision of the future and instead utilize the United States as a scapegoat for their hopelessness.

It matters because into the void of failed states, and lives without hope or the prospect for betterment, step terrorists, fanatics, extremists, and others who take advantage of these situations for their own ends.

If a state is unable to educate its young, terrorists and extremists will only be too happy to indoctrinate the young, poisoning their minds. If a country is unable to offer young men or women the prospect of a job and self-respect, terrorists, fanatics, and extremists are more than happy to offer conspiracy theories to explain misfortune and offer alternative employment in their criminal enterprises. And if a government is unable to offer

its people a positive prospect for the future, terrorists or fanatics are able to offer their own distorted view of the world and twisted vision of the future.

It matters because poverty creates the swamp in which the terrorists find protection and sustenance, and it matters in short because our national security interests and the lives and safety of our citizens depend on us recognizing this. It matters, I strongly believe, because self-interest aside, the United States has a strong moral global obligation, especially in cases such as Afghanistan and now Pakistan, to provide assistance to those who have helped us in the past and who stand with us today in this war on terrorism.

Foreign assistance and development assistance are valuable elements in our toolbox to respond to the events of September 11, and in cases where diplomacy or military force cannot be used, they may be the only tools available.

When nations who are friends or allies of the United States were subject to terrorist attacks prior to September 11, all too often the U.S. reaction was to bemoan the rough neighborhood in which these nations live and shrug our shoulders as if nothing could be done. But September 11 proved with startling clarity all of the globe is a neighborhood today, our neighborhood, and we must see what can be done; for if we continue to do nothing, it is at our peril.

I would not argue that the United States should waste foreign assistance spending on ineffective programs, or on projects where rampant corruption prevents us from assuring that our assistance reaches those in need.

But a report last year by the Overseas Development Council suggests that many aid programs have been successful. They have contributed to advances in public health, sanitation, and education.

As a first step in this new war on global poverty, then, it is critical that the government, private foundations, and nongovernmental organizations come together to identify areas where increased spending can make a difference, especially in the world's poorest regions. This review must also look at what government and private voluntary donors have learned about how to make delivery of assistance more effective.

This evaluation should also extend to the activities of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other multilateral development and lending institutions. Where these institutions need to be reformed, and I believe they do, their activities should be redefined today.

Once this evaluation is complete, I believe it is critical we reverse the past two decades of a downward trend in U.S. foreign assistance spending and dramatically increase funding, including that channeled through foundations and nongovernmental organizations.

According to the U.N. Development Program, some \$40 billion a year—remember, we are at \$15 billion—would provide water and sanitation, reproductive health, basic health and nutrition, and basic education for all in need in the developing world.

To help meet our share of this need, I believe and propose we triple the foreign assistance budget within 5 years, bringing it back up to what it was before, roughly, and this is still a meager amount, 0.3 percent of gross domestic product. I fully believe such an increase in United States foreign assistance spending would be leveraged by increases in assistance contributions by other potential public and private donors.

In addition to traditional economic development programs, our renewed focus on fighting international poverty must also focus on the creation of public goods, democratic institutions, rule of law, functioning and legitimate educational systems which allow public and economic progress and growth to take root and flourish.

The image of "draining the swamp" of terrorists has become a commonplace metaphor, but the metaphor has its limits. The environmental elements which contribute to the germination and flourishing of terrorists and extremists cannot, in fact, simply be drained away. Indeed, I am worried that if we do not act wisely and address every dimension and level of this war on terrorism we run the risk of fueling a new generation of terrorists.

Rather, we must adopt a long-term, carefully crafted strategy to reduce and perhaps even eliminate factors such as global poverty, which underlie and foster terrorism. So I call upon my colleagues to recognize that such long-term efforts are as much a part of the burden of global leadership and the war on terrorism as cruise missiles and aircraft carriers. Meeting this obligation of leadership demands and requires a serious, long-term commitment of the necessary resources by the United States.

As one Senator, I am prepared to make that commitment and I hope my colleagues are as well.

I yield the floor.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1941

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), for herself and Mr. BROWNBACK, proposes an amendment numbered 1940.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the important role of women in the future reconstruction of Afghanistan)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

#### SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE FUTURE RECONSTRUCTION OF AFGHANISTAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:

(1) Prior to the rise of the Taliban in 1996, women throughout Afghanistan enjoyed greater freedoms, compromising 70 percent of school teachers, 50 percent of civilian government workers, and 40 percent of doctors in Kabul.

(2) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women have been banished from the work force, schools have been closed to girls and women expelled from universities, women have been prohibited from leaving their homes unless accompanied by a close male relative, and publicly visible windows of women's houses have been ordered to be painted black.

(3) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women have been forced to wear the burqa (or chadari)—which completely shrouds the body, leaving only a small mesh-covered opening through which to see.

(4) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women and girls have been prohibited from being examined by male physicians whole at the same time, most female doctors and nurses have been prohibited from working.

(5) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women have been brutally beaten, publicly flogged, and killed for violating Taliban decrees.

(6) The United States and the United Nations have never recognized the Taliban as the legitimate government of Afghanistan, in part, because of their horrific treatment of women and girls.

(7) Afghan women and children now make up 75 percent of the millions of Afghan refugees living in neighboring countries in substandard conditions with little food and virtually no clean water or sanitation.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Afghan women organizations must be included in planning the future reconstruction of Afghanistan.

(2) Future governments in Afghanistan should work to achieve the following goals:

(A) The effective participation of women in all civil, economic, and social life.

(B) The right of women to work.

(C) The right of women and girls to an education without discrimination and the re-opening of schools to women and girls at all levels of education.

(D) The freedom of movement of women and girls.

(E) Equal access of women and girls to health facilities.

Mrs. BOXER. For the benefit of my colleagues, I will not take but about 7 minutes on this and one other amendment dealing with suicide bombing, both of which I believe will be adopted. I will be very brief and ask my colleagues' indulgence.

Madam President, I know you are very well aware of the women in Afghanistan under the rule of the Taliban. I give praise to this organization called Fund for the Feminist Majority that brought this issue to my attention several years ago. I was unaware of what the Taliban were, what they were doing to women. My friends came to see me and not only told me about the abuses of the Taliban toward women but they also told me the women were forced to wear these burqas, dehumanizing them, taking away every semblance of humanity from the women.

Therefore, what we try to do in this amendment after we detail the condition of women, which the clerk read so beautifully, we talk about the fact they have to wear the burqas which completely shroud their body, leaving only a small mesh-covered opening through which to see. Americans have seen that on TV. Women are completely obscured. If you try on one of those burqas, you can barely breathe.

We know women in Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan have been prohibited from being examined by male physicians while, at the same time, most female doctors and nurses have been prohibited from working. We know women have been brutally beaten and publicly flogged, even executed, and we have seen that on CNN on an incredible documentary called "From Beneath The Veil."

Senator BROWNBACK and I in this amendment say it is the sense of the Senate that Afghan women organizations must be included in planning for the future reconstruction of Afghanistan and that the goal of the new government should be equality for all.

That is all I have to say about this amendment. I ask it be laid aside, and I ask to call up my second amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1941

Mrs. BOXER. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 1941.

(Purpose: Condemning suicide bombings as a terrorist act)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

#### SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE CONDEMNING SUICIDE BOMBINGS AS A TERRORIST ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:

(1) Suicide bombings have killed and injured countless people throughout the world.

(2) Suicide bombings and the resulting death and injury demean the importance of human life.

(3) There are no circumstances under which suicide bombings can be justified, including considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

(4) Religious leaders, including the highest Muslim authority in Saudi Arabia, the Grand Mufti, have spoken out against suicide bombings.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Suicide bombings are a horrific form of terrorism that must be universally condemned.

(2) The United Nations should specifically condemn all suicide bombings by resolution.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I think this amendment is very clear. As far as we can tell, the United Nations has never passed a specific resolution condemning suicide bombings, nor has the Senate done it, as far as I can tell. This would be important. Religious leaders of all kinds have basically said

there is never a political reason, a philosophical reason, an ideological reason, a racial, ethnic, or religious reason, no reason for someone to become a suicide bomber. It demeans life.

I am very hopeful the managers of the bill will accept this amendment. I have no need to speak any longer on it except to say I am hopeful it will be passed.

I ask the Presiding Officer if it is appropriate because I want to make sure the amendment is disposed of—if it is appropriate to ask for the yeas and nays or simply to lay it aside at this time; what is appropriate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can do either.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask this amendment be laid aside. In doing so, I have two amendments laid aside, one dealing with the Afghan women and one dealing with suicide bombings. I thank my colleagues for their forbearance. I am pleased to be on the Foreign Relations Committee where I have an opportunity to work on these matters.

I thank my Republican friend, and I ask unanimous consent that Senator ALLEN be added as the original cosponsor of the suicide bombing amendment. I thank him and Senator BROWNBACK for working with me on both issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is laid aside.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Before the Senator from California leaves, I wonder if she would put me on the two amendments, and I thank the Senator for recognizing I have been waiting. I do appreciate the brevity.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my colleague. I am very proud to ask unanimous consent that Senator DOMENICI as an original cosponsor of both amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WORKING TOGETHER

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about history, but strangely enough, short history—the last 3½ to 4 weeks. Because so much has happened in that period of time, I am firmly of the opinion today that while we will return to some level of normalcy and we will all begin to understand what has changed in the world, we all found out in a short period of time what kind of people terrorists are and what they will do. Americans can hardly understand how somebody would organize people—having no country, no real habitat, with no concern except to wreak havoc on those they do not like. We live in that new bubble.

I rise today to urge that we continue one other important thing. I believe we have a long-time reputation of being the body wherein issues are argued, debates can even go on forever. What we did immediately after that New York disaster, when the terrorists showed their true light to the Americans, was

we decided in the Congress we would not conduct business as usual. Something rather magnificent happened. The public perceives us completely differently. We, too, have changed in their opinion because we lock arms on big issues, we work very hard behind the scenes with experts. We come to the floor and, with a minimum of debate, we pass important measures.

That has been one of the most significant signals to our own people and to the terrorists of the world, that we can adjust this great Republic to the modern problems, the problems we never, ever, anticipated, even 2 years ago, much less when our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written.

I think something is going awry, that maybe this unity is falling apart or breaking. I am hearing leadership offer their own proposals. Just yesterday I heard the majority leader, who I thought was doing a magnificent job joining with Republicans, introducing a reconciliation package. I thought we were going to work the big issues together.

I urge that we return to that mode and during the next 4 to 6 weeks, or however long we want to spend, we complete some very fundamental work and we get on with a few packages that will indicate we need to do something new and different. That way, we would not have either the tremendous buildup and pressure of not being able to get things done, nor would we have a cantankerous partisan debate over matters that could easily be resolved, as we resolved the first four or five bills of importance when New York was still on fire and the Pentagon was still steaming because we hadn't put out the fires deep inside the beaten-upon building that was a symbol of our strength.

I also want to say something else is happening which makes this a very difficult burden for our President, for us, and for the American people. First I commend the President. I think he has done a tremendous job. I believe he leads not only us but I think right-minded people everywhere, although they all have different political problems. They are seeing America, now, under his leadership, presenting a real opportunity for the world to get rid of terrorism. They are joining us, not one or two a day, but in flocks; the countries of the world are joining us.

Maybe from this will come a new world order. Who knows? I said that a few weeks ago. The father of this President came into office saying he wanted to work for a new world order. Things got out of hand. The new President did not claim that. But, because of the courage, tenacity, faith, he is leading the Nation to a whole new set of alliances, all of which I see as very positive.

It seems to me Russia and America may come out very differently as a result of this incident. It also seems to me that a number of countries that were not willing to join us are looking

around and saying: We would like to help America.

Most of what I have just said indicates a desire to unite and work together. What a joy to see all Members, Democrat and Republican—mayor Republican, Governor Republican, Senators Democrat—go to New York City. There wasn't anybody there trying to get their way. They were trying to get together and get something going for the people of New York and for our country. Again, unity paid off in really big dividends.

We don't usually think of our leaders, under our evolved two-party system, in a way that says, if you will just unite, you will do the best thing you can for our people. But I think that is happening. That has taken a back seat because today we are talking about anthrax, and we are learning. I want to compliment all the professionals who worked on it. I really believe they did the very best they could under the circumstances. I compliment them all.

We are learning brand new things even about this particular microorganism. We are learning that maybe it is spread easier than we had learned in the textbooks and that the scientists said. Maybe you can aerosol it much easier than we thought. We thought that was a very difficult thing. We thought it required very efficient kinds of equipment and tremendous resources. It still may. We don't have the answer yet. But I don't believe we ought to start arguing among ourselves about this particular problem. I think we ought to also join together, listen to our experts, and if we need to do some more things quickly, let's do them. Let's not run to see who is going to get credit. Let's not try to put bill upon bill just to spend money.

I want to remind everyone we are down to about \$50 billion in surplus from \$176 billion just 5 or 6 weeks ago, and this is the surplus we didn't even want to touch. It is the accumulated surplus that was all going to go on the debt. We are down to \$50 billion or so, but we see the bills people are proposing under the rubric of stimulus plus expansion of social welfare programs. I trace our longer history, not just 3 weeks, and find we never did try to expand those programs in our serious recessions before. They were taken up in due course, not as a stimulus, not as an emergency. That has to do with COBRA and other programs at which we are looking.

But I think we have to face up to the reality that every night we are looking at Afghanistan on the television, trying to figure out how are we doing, whose side is winning, what is happening, and here at home we are engaging our best scientists in this dread illness. This illness comes from a product that is very common. I think the Senator in the chair knows that out west, where we have a lot of cows and pens for cows and the like, these spores are prevalent everywhere. In my State, in northern New Mexico, there are many

of them. We treat them properly, give them their proper respect, and they don't go anywhere because people either take antibiotics or take treatment, and we go on with our lives.

But the overhanging problem is the American economy. When it is flourishing, we can do almost anything. When it is coming down and in recession, it has a tendency to harm an awful lot of people. The cycle in American capitalism, which nobody has cured yet, when it starts coming down and unemployment goes up and the other things that we know about come about—obviously, productivity is not growing like it was, many people are put out of work, many businesses go bankrupt, many families have to ask the Government to help because, through no fault of their own, they can't be employed. We can't order them to be employed, if we want to use the great system that has built this country to its enormous material powerhouse status.

I want to say the third thing we have on our platter makes it a very big platter. Three big things sit there, straining America: There is a war that is different from any we had, and there is a human commitment by the American people, in spite of its difference, despite its ferocity, despite the risks we have to take—it is amazing, the American people, in excess of 90 percent, say stay with it; go get them. It is amazing that they say America is on the right path.

We always ask, are we on the right path or the wrong path? This is one time we have been united and they know we are on the right path when it comes to this war. Americans, given the facts, although they are a little more frightened than they have been in the past, will support an appropriate, righteous cause.

We are not without fault. But certainly we do not deserve, either from our own citizens or from people in the world, some of the things said about America. We are flourishing because we have a great system. And we have not destroyed our own system. We have lived with it, made it grow, and when things had to change, they changed peacefully and parties got new agendas for their candidates and we established new things to make America grow. When America grows, we can do much more for education, we can do more for all the things that we cherish, and we can give our taxpayers a little bit of the empathy they need so they can grow and prosper.

So far, as I look at it, it seems to me we are going to wake up in 3 or 4 weeks when we get some new economic numbers. I regret saying I think there will be a new headline. The headline will be: America In Recession. Those speaking about it are saying we don't know quite how to fix it. I have sensed that for quite some time. I added my own economics that I do, having worked with a lot of these people, had conversations, and then we look for some

big facts. I just want to share one that is very startling, and that has to do with a very important characteristic of our economy—industrial production.

The problem is that industrial production figures that were released just 1 week ago yesterday morning—we are down 1 percent in the month of September. This year alone, that great measure of our productivity, and of our production, will be down 6 percent. That is as much as it went down in the entire 1990–1991 recession.

Put another way: This is the 12th consecutive month of that kind of decline. This is the longest decline in industrial production since World War II. I understand it doesn't have all of the significance it had during this period since World War II. It has been pushed aside as a major indicator by some other things. But it is still a major one.

I believe our mission is simple: Get together on the appropriations bills, no excuses, unite, have our leaders unite, and let's get them done. Let's just say it ought not be an excuse big enough to deny our desire to work together in a unified way to get the ordinary business done. I think when we were beginning to move, our buildings were closed down. Who would have thought of that? Nonetheless, that is the case.

We are trying to find ways to work even though the buildings are not quite accommodating. We are getting there. We are forcing some accommodations so we can do our work.

In addition, we have to finish up the work of an appropriations bill that appropriates money which we put in, in the early days for New York and for defense. Remember that we passed that to send a signal and to appropriate the money, but we said it is subject to a new appropriations bill. That has to be done. That requires unity. That requires Senators and Congressmen to give up some things and get on with a package with consensus, and then unite together and say let's do it. Some say it was too big a package. We will have to add a lot. Let's just say that considering America's future and what we are, the worst thing would be for us to not do what we have promised to do. The second worst is to not continue on with evaluations and then pass laws and appropriations to fill some very serious holes we have—clearly in the medical area, biomedical, and chemical.

In terms of our country, we were at war in a sense, but we really didn't understand the significance of biological and chemical warfare. We weren't as well prepared. But whom do you want to blame for that? Some people are now beginning to ask. There have been Senators, House Members, and Presidents who have spoken to terrorism. They have spoken to the issue of biological and chemical warfare. But I can tell you from our own experience on one bill. We passed a bill that is commonly known as Nunn-Lugar-Domenici which is now in 126 cities with \$670 million a

year. It takes the first responders, fire, policemen, and medical teams; it organizes them so they move in harmony again, in unity.

It was very hard during the first 2 or 3 years to get cities to willingly participate. There is no criticism, but they did not like the idea because they did not want to let their people think they were subject to any real problems from outside. It took 3 years to get the program implemented. It took the U.S. Government's executive branch to divide it into three parts instead of in unity. It is implemented by three different Departments of our Government. Obviously, we learn about that now. We are in trouble. We are going to seek unity of purpose with reference thereto.

I also suggest that the economy needs an economic stimulus plan. I remind everyone, this economy is faltering. I don't believe we should be the first as Senators from different States that may have problems to run and say we need to pay for a new program. Every program and every tax proposal ought to be subject to that. Let's consider it. How does it help the economy grow? I think if it doesn't, it ought to be on another calendar. We don't know with precision, but we know pretty well that a bridge construction program that comes into effect 3 or 4 years from now may be a good program because we need bridges, but it is not an economic stimulus package. I think we have come to the conclusion that highway bridges and like programs, if we need them, are good programs, but for the most part they are not programs that will accelerate the growth in this economy. Instead of everybody going to the wall on that, that can be organized and talked about.

We can get on with doing what we don't do so well. But we have done marvelously well for the last 5 or 6 weeks to commit to the American people that until we finish our business, including a stimulus package, if we can do it, we are going to lock arms and finish on an upbeat note that says we are united to do what we can about this terrible new enemy. We are absolutely committed to give our President what he needs militarily, and we encourage him to follow them to their demise.

To the extent we have additional stimulus ideas, we ought to take a good look to see if we can do them together. If it is OK, we can then come in the next year. We don't have to do everything in the next 3 or 4 weeks. We will learn a lot about this problem in the next 5 or 6 weeks. Instead of passing bills, we will have some very refined examinations and appraisals of our problems.

For instance, everybody always hears me talk about the laboratories that do our nuclear work. The people who visit them say they are crown jewels in terms of research capacity. I think it still shocks people to know that, for instance, in this area that has to do with this biological enemy that we are

fighting now, those two laboratories combined in expertise, if not the paramount source of evidence, are the paramount source of definition about these spores. That happens to be a program they have in place, and they are being called upon now to be some of the experts to resolve some of these unknown issues. We have to help put all of those together to work in unison under our new manager of domestic problems, a wonderful former Governor, Governor Ridge.

I close by saying to the Senators from both sides of the aisle, House Members and those who are in close contact with our Members, let's get back to where we were and seek unity; let's try to lock arms and get our basic job done, the extraordinary work done, and do it in such a way that Americans can continue to feel what they feel about this Government. They totally support our President. They think we are better than we have ever been. I don't think we need to fight when we have an enemy that will just capitalize on anything going on in our country that is tearing at us. They think they are going to cause that. We ought to do just the opposite.

Thank you for the privilege of speaking today. I yield the floor.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, is there an amendment pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are two amendments that have been set aside.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I know the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is off the floor. So I will not move any action while he is gone.

I wish to urge Senators who have amendments to come forward. There is no reason this bill cannot be finished. Even if we finish it fairly soon, I hope Members of the Senate will realize the importance of this bill.

I remember coming to the Senate at a time when so many would talk about foreign aid as some kind of a massive giveaway. People would ask, What have these countries done to help us? Why are we sending money there? Fortunately, at that time we had people such as Senator Mike Mansfield, a happy memory in the Senate, and people who preceded the Presiding Officer, Senator Jacob Javits on the Republican side who knew how important these programs were.

Of course, you can argue that there are a whole number of reasons. We are the wealthiest, most powerful nation history has ever known. You could speak to the moral reasons we should be helping other countries. We could talk about what it does for our security interests. If we bring about stability in other parts of the world, we help democracy flourish. We would help the middle class build up in areas

that otherwise were prone to overthrows of governments, instability, rebellions.

I think of some of the programs that Members of this body have proposed—not necessarily on this bill but others—the School Lunch Program for Africa that former Senator Dole and former Senator McGovern proposed.

I recall last year being down at the White House when they discussed this with President Clinton, and the interesting points brought out. They were talking about countries where families could not feed their children any way, not mentioning anything about educating them.

But if we help those countries have a school lunch program, something that costs us a tiny fraction of what we spend on foreign aid, then children could go to school and learn. But also in a lot of these countries where girls do not go to school, where only the boys go to school, some of the families said: Wait a minute. If we can feed our daughters as well as our sons, we will be able to do that.

Now, what has happened in doing that is we not only benefit those countries, but we can benefit the people there. We carry out the moral aspects of our foreign aid bill. But then we also have money in this bill for health care, not only the health care of the people in these other countries, but there is a provision which would allow us to build up the medical infrastructure of other nations to get rid of possibly another Ebola plague, to have an early warning system when one is existing so the country can act to stop it.

Now, this is not just altruism. There is no disease anywhere in the world that is more than an airplane trip or a postage stamp away from our own country. If we can help countries fight these diseases within their own borders, not only do they help those people but they help all the rest of us.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENTS NOS. 1942 THROUGH 1948, EN BLOC

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I have discussed this with Senator McConnell. We have a number of amendments I will just briefly describe.

There is one by Senator HELMS on Venezuela, one by Senator McCONNELL and myself on development credit authority, another Leahy-McConnell amendment on MDB authorizations, a McConnell-Leahy amendment on documentation center, an amendment by Senator McCONNELL on nuclear safety, a Mikulski amendment on small business, and a Gordon Smith amendment on religious freedom. Also, there are

two previously offered amendments by Senator BOXER; one is on Afghan reconstruction and one is on suicide bombings.

I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to send all the amendments to the desk; that they be considered to be in order; that they be considered en bloc, and they be adopted en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 1942 through 1948), en bloc, were agreed to, as follows:

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1942

On page 142, line 21, after the colon, insert the following: "Provided further, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, up to \$2,000,000 should be made available to support democracy-building activities in Venezuela."

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1943

On page 130, line 4, strike "September 30, 2003", and insert in lieu thereof: "expended".

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1944

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

##### AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. . The Secretary of the Treasury may, to fulfill commitments of the United States, contribute on behalf of the United States to the seventh replenishment of the resources of the Asian Development Fund, a special fund of the Asian Development Bank, and to the fifth replenishment of the resources of the International Fund for Agriculture Development. The following amounts are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury: \$412,000,000 for the Asian Development Fund and \$30,000,000 for the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1945

On page 133, line 8 insert before the period: "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$250,000 should be made available for assistance for the Documentation Center of Cambodia: Provided further, That no later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall report to the Committees on Appropriations on a 3-year funding strategy for the Documentation Center of Cambodia."

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1946

(Purpose: Technical amendment)

On page 136, line 24 strike "\$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$35,000,000".

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1947

On page 190, between line 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

(f) SMALL BUSINESS.—In entering into multiple award indefinite-quantity contracts with funds appropriated by this Act, the United States Agency for International Development may provide an exception to the fair opportunity process for placing task orders under such contracts when the order is placed with any category of small or small disadvantaged business.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1948

(Purpose: To restrict the availability of funds for the Government of the Russian Federation unless certain conditions are met)

On page 232, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

## DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MINORITY RELIGIOUS FAITHS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SEC. 581. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for the Government of the Russian Federation after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, unless the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives that the Government of the Russian Federation has not implemented any statute, executive order, regulation, or other similar government action that would discriminate, or would have as its principal effect discrimination, against religious groups or religious communities in the Russian Federation in violation of accepted international agreements on human rights and religious freedoms to which the Russian Federation is a party.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, as a freshman Senator in 1997, I offered an amendment to the foreign operations bill that predicated foreign aid to the Russian Federation on the implementation of a new law restricting religious freedom in Russia. That law, passed by the Russian Duma on July 4, 1997, had the potential of severely restricting freedom of religion in Russia. The bill was ironically titled "on freedom of conscience and on religious associations."

That bill was eventually signed into law—a law that required religious groups to register with the State and submit their religious doctrines and practices to scrutiny by a commission of experts with the power to deny religious status. Without this status, these groups would lose the rights to rent or own property, employ religious workers or conduct charitable and educational activities. Clearly that law in Russia and its implementation would have a grave impact on religious freedom in that country.

I am happy to report that my 1997 amendment passed the Senate 95 to 4. I would also note that both the bill managers, Senators LEAHY and MCCONNELL, voted in favor of this amendment and I thank them for their support.

In following years this amendment was included as part of the foreign operations bill. This year it was not. I rise today to offer this same amendment again and understand that it will be accepted by the managers of this bill sometime today during its consideration.

In my years in the Senate I have remained vigilant on the issue of religious freedom. The Foreign Relations Committee has held yearly hearings on religious freedom abroad—especially what is going on in the Russian Federation. I also host, with the Department of State, a series of yearly roundtable discussions on religious freedom.

These roundtable discussions are attended by members of each religious community impacted by this new law in Russia and by various State Department and NSC officials that are responsible for religious freedom abroad.

As the years went by and the registration period closed regarding religions, it was felt by all those interested in religious freedom in that country that this amendment was a positive influence on how the new Russian law was implemented.

It let the Russian Government know that Americans cared about freedom of religion in Russia—that the eyes of the world were upon the Russian Government as it implemented the law on religions.

Although the amendment has never been implemented—and each year aid has gone out to the Russian Federation—the amendment's influence and impact has been positive and undeniable according to those religions "on the ground" in Russia.

In general many of the problems initially have worked themselves out under this new law. Many of the problems with denials of registration or persecution have occurred in the far reaches of the Russian Federation. The conventional wisdom regarding implementation of that law is that persecution occurs abroad—the farther away from Moscow and the centralized government, the greater the risk is for religious intolerance.

But even in Moscow there is a requirement of vigilance. And I am happy to report that this body has been vigilant on this issue—especially regarding the old problem of anti-Semitism in Russia. Some might say that we shouldn't single out Russia regarding this issue. I would agree—we should fight anti-Semitism in every nation including our own.

Because I believe that how a nation treats the sons and daughters of Israel is a bellweather for tolerance.

I would like to submit for the RECORD letters from years past that almost all of my colleagues signed regarding their concerns over the rise in anti-Semitism in Russia. Each of these letters contain 98 to 99 signatures—virtually all of the Senate was united on this issue.

I firmly believe that this language is needed again this year. I would also like to submit for the RECORD a letter from NCSJ—advocates on behalf of Jews in Russia, Ukraine, the Baltic States and Eurasia. NCSJ is the leading advocate for the plight and well-being of the Jewish community in Russia.

NCSJ's executive director, Mark Levin, writes:

We wish to underline NCSJ's support for your amendment to condition certain assistance to the Russian Federation on verification by President Bush that the Russian Government has no way acted to restrict freedom of religion as guaranteed by international commitments and treaties.

... the 1997 law on religion, under which "non-traditional" groups must register with government authorities, has continued to generate misunderstandings, difficulties and intimidation.

The Russian law, among other things, limits the activities of foreign missionaries and grants unregistered

"religious groups" fewer rights than accredited Russian religious organizations such as the Russian Orthodox Church, Islam, Judaism and Buddhism. This law if poorly implemented, could also sharply restrict the activities of foreign missionaries in Russia.

The Russian Government should permit foreign missionaries to enter and reside in Russia—within the framework of Russian law—and work with fellow believers.

Furthermore, foreign missionaries should be allowed to enjoy the religious freedom guaranteed Russian citizens and legal residents by the Russian constitution, OSCE commitments, and other international agreements to which Russia is signatory.

One of my own constituents, Pastor Dan Pollard, is a missionary with a church in the Russian far east—in a town called Vanino. Pastor Pollard has been continually harassed by local officials, many who cite the 1997 law as an official reason for barring Pollard from ministering.

I thank the managers again for accepting this amendment as part of the foreign operations bill and hope that this legislation sends a strong signal to President Putin that human rights and religious freedom are core American values and we seek to share them with all our friends and allies. However it must be understood that American dollars will not find their way to support a country that treats freedom of religion in such a manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letters to which I previously referred.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY,

Washington, DC, October 8, 2001.

Hon. GORDON SMITH,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: We wish to underline NCSJ's support for your amendment to condition certain assistance to the Russian Federation on verification by President Bush that the Russian government has in no way acted to restrict freedom of religion as guaranteed by international commitments and treaties.

We are encouraged that President Putin continues to express public support for tolerance and pluralism. Nevertheless, some disturbing trends toward intolerance and oppression remain of concern. In particular, the 1997 Law on Religion, under which "non-traditional" groups must register with government authorities, has continued to generate misunderstandings, difficulties and intimidation. Groups such as Jehovah's Witnesses and Evangelical Christians have had financial assets and membership rolls confiscated, and some have been subject to outright violence.

In addition, new incidents of anti-Semitism have also arisen, affecting the Jewish community. Judaism is, under Russian law, a sanctioned ("traditional") religion. Unfortunately, at times local police response to acts of hate against schools and synagogues has been delayed. And, in October 2000, the federal Interior Ministry conducted an illegal, prolonged search of the Moscow Choral Synagogue.

We write in a spirit of cooperation and concern for the fabric of Russian society. We believe Russia can and should be a country that embraces and celebrates religious differences. By monitoring progress toward unrestricted religious liberty, we can help ensure that it will come to pass.

Thank you for your continuous leadership in this cause.

Respectfully,

MARK B. LEVIN,  
*Executive Director.*

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, June 18, 1999.

President BORIS YELTSIN,  
*Russian Federation, The Kremlin,  
Moscow, Russia.*

DEAR PRESIDENT YELTSIN: We are writing to you to express our serious concerns over the rise in anti-Semitic rhetoric heard at both the national and local levels of Russian society and politics. We strongly believe that the first line of defense against the growth of anti-Semitism in your country is exposing and condemning the hate-filled rhetoric at all levels of contact between our two governments.

As you know, recent events and remarks in Russia have marred this decade's re-emergence of Jewish life in post-communist Russia. The Russian Jewish community now numbers upwards of one million, and the opening of synagogues, schools and community centers has been a bright counterpoint to the centuries of violence and anti-Semitic laws against the Russian Jewish community. We strongly feel that the recent spate of anti-Semitic rhetoric, in particular those comments from Russian communist and extremist/nationalist political groups, should be disavowed. In particular, the fascist extremism exhibited by Alexander Barkashov's Russia National Unity Party is alarming in its use of slanderous stereotyping and crude scapegoating.

Recently, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on European Affairs held a hearing on the rise of anti-Semitism in Russia. This was not the first hearing on this subject—in fact, the Senate held hearings and considered resolutions regarding the treatment of Jews in Tsarist Russia as early as 1879. Over the years it has not been unusual for the United States to act on this subject, linking American foreign policy with what should now be regarded as a cornerstone of human rights policies in Russia.

While we support a strong effort to address the economic difficulties in Russia and encourage the development of a strong, market-oriented economy, we want you to know that the United States also expects from Russia a strong commitment to human rights and religious freedom. As your country enters an election cycle, there may well be temptations to sound ultra-nationalist themes that attempt to blame the small Jewish community for Russia's problems.

President Yeltsin, we believe it is imperative that you demonstrate, through your emphatic disagreement with those who espouse anti-Semitism in Russia, your understanding of the importance the Russian government places upon religious freedom. The United States predicates its support for democratic institutions in Russia upon unwavering opposition to anti-Semitism at any level, in any form. While we are pleased by your administration's statements against anti-Semitism, the horrific explosions near two of Moscow's largest synagogues on May 1st and the recent attacks on the only synagogue in Birobidzhan, are reason enough for further vigorous and more public condemnation.

We hope you share our deep concern for this issue and look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Craig Thomas, Sam Brownback, Charles Schumer, Joe Lieberman, Wayne Allard, Paul D. Wellstone, Harry Reid, Barbara Boxer, Peter G. Fitzgerald, John Edwards, Bob Smith, Mike Crapo, Rick Santorum, Chuck Robb, Susan Collins, Ted Kennedy, Carl Levin, Jim Inhofe.

Mitch McConnell, Jeff Bingaman, Barbara A. Mikulski, Richard Shelby, Tim Hutchinson, Jeff Sessions, Paul Coverdell, Arlen Specter, Russ Feingold, Olympia Snowe, Richard H. Byron, Strom Thurmond, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Jim Jeffords, Spencer Abraham, George V. Voinovich, Blanche L. Lincoln, Patty Murray, Patrick Leahy, Mike DeWine, Mary L. Landrieu, Jim Bunning, Pete V. Domenici, Herb Kohl, Jack Reed, Frank H. Murkowski, Bob Kerrey, John Breaux, Larry E. Craig, Rod Grams.

Jesse Helms, Daniel K. Inouye, Dick Durbin, John Warner, Kent Conrad, Tom Daschle, Jon Kyl, Bill Roth, John F. Kerry, Orrin Hatch, Chris Dodd, Slade Gorton, Paul Sarbanes, Byron L. Dorgan, Robert Torricelli, Ron Wyden, Michael B. Enzi, Kit Bond, John Ashcroft, John McCain, Evan Bayh, Connie Mack, Max Baucus, Frank R. Lautenberg, Dick Lugar, Chuck Grassley, Jay Rockefeller, Daniel K. Akaka, Dianne Feinstein, Max Cleland.

Phil Gramm, Conrad Burns, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Robert F. Bennett, Bob Graham, Fritz Hollings, Daniel P. Moynihan, Tim Johnson, Don Nickles, Trent Lott, Bill Frist, Fred Thompson, Ted Stevens, Tom Harkin, Thad Cochran, Pat Roberts, John Chafee, Judd Gregg, Robert C. Byrd.

U.S. SENATE

Washington, DC, March 9, 2000.

HON. VLADIMIR PUTIN,  
*Acting President, Russian Federation, The Kremlin, Moscow, Russia.*

DEAR PRESIDENT PUTIN: As you assume your new leadership position, we write to you with hope for your success in leading Russia through a newly prosperous and democratic millennium. We are writing to you, as we have to other Russian leaders, to express our repeated concerns over the risk in anti-Semitic rhetoric heard at both the national and local levels of Russian society and politics.

We strongly encourage you to make fighting anti-Semitism one of the priorities of your new administration. President Putin, we believe it is imperative that you demonstrate, through your emphatic disagreement with those who espouse anti-Semitism in Russia, your understanding of the importance the Russian government places upon religious freedom. We understand that in past discussions with both Russian and American Jewish leaders you have expressed your concern about anti-Semitism. We applaud your past comments and efforts and urge you to take corresponding action in keeping with your new position as acting president.

The Russian Jewish community represents a vibrant and active portion of the Russian population. Though emigration has reduced the community size in the past ten years, the birth of democracy in the Russian Federation has also resulted in the opening of new synagogues, schools and community centers in Moscow, St. Petersburg and beyond. Currently there are almost 200 Jewish organizations, institutions, and religious

communities in 75 cities and towns throughout Russia. One hundred and fifteen schools serve over 7,000 students, and Jewish organizations publish 18 newspapers and journals. This open and free blossoming of culture and community will only benefit the Russian nation and her people.

Anti-Semitism in Russia must not become a weapon in the struggle for power by political parties. Indecisive actions on the part of the Russian government only further feed the belief that hate is an allowable and integral component of political life. The hate-filled rhetoric of a number of Communist Party leaders, some of whom retain important parliamentary positions, must be condemned by your strong deed and word. Further, it is our belief, that the violence that follows such hate, for example the May, 1999 Moscow synagogue bombings, must always be strongly and loudly condemned in order to avoid further violence in the future.

President Putin, last year ninety-nine out of 100 United States Senators signed a letter to President Yeltsin similar to this one. Few issues in politics unite the United States Senate more. As we wrote your predecessor, we believe it is imperative that you demonstrate, through your emphatic disagreement with those who espouse anti-Semitism in Russia, your understanding of the importance the Russian government places upon religious freedom. The United States predicates its support for democratic institutions in Russia upon unwavering opposition to anti-Semitism at any level, in any form.

We hope you share our deep concern for this issue and look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Gordon H. Smith, Joe Biden, Jr., Sam Brownback, Frank R. Lautenberg, Craig Thomas, Chuck Robb, Rod Grams, Daniel P. Moynihan, Phil Gramm, Carl Levin, Bill Frist, Patty Murray, Jim Inhofe, Mike Crapo, Rick Santorum, Fritz Hollings, Orrin Hatch, Mike DeWine, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Jeff Sessions, Mitch McConnell, Dick Durbin.

Jay Rockefeller, Kent Conrad, Larry E. Craig, Harry Reid, Robert F. Bennett, Jesse Helms, Max Cleland, Blanche L. Lincoln, Bob Smith, Spencer Abraham, Tim Hutchinson, Conrad Burns, Robert Torricelli, Paul Sarbanes, Charles Schumer, Dick Lugar, Pat Roberts, Dianne Feinstein, Herb Kohl, Pete V. Domenici, Tim Johnson, Frank H. Murkowski, Jack Reed, George V. Voinovich, John Ashcroft, Chris Dodd, Susan Collins, Fred Thompson, Patrick Leahy, Judd Gregg, Bill Roth, Bob Kerrey.

Thad Cochran, Ted Kennedy, Michael B. Enzi, Kit Bond, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Richard H. Byron, Olympia Snowe, John McCain, John Warner, Strom Thurmond, John F. Kerry, Jon Kyl, Daniel K. Inouye, Daniel K. Akaka, Russ Feingold, Byron L. Dorgan, Arlen Specter, Barbara A. Mikulski, Joe Lieberman, Jeff Bingaman, Tom Harkin, Slade Gorton, Jim Jeffords, Ted Stevens, Connie Mack, Bob Graham, Wayne Allard, Ron Wyden, Max Baucus, Tom Daschle, John Breaux, Jim Bunning.

Paul D. Wellstone, Don Nickles, Chuck Grassley, Richard Shelby, Lincoln Chafee, Barbara Boxer, Peter G. Fitzgerald, Evan Bayh, Mary L. Landrieu, John Edwards, Paul D. Coverdell, Trent Lott.

U.S. SENATE,  
Washington, DC, August 3, 2001.  
His Excellency VLADIMIR PUTIN,  
President, Russian Federation, The Kremlin,  
Moscow, Russia.

DEAR PRESIDENT PUTIN: We are writing to you, as members of the United States Senate to again express our concerns over the anti-Semitic rhetoric heard at both the national and local levels of Russian society and politics.

In years past, the U.S. Senate has been united in its condemnation of such virulent anti-Semitism, which, unfortunately, has been present during much of Russia's history. Your remarks last year publicly condemning anti-Semitism assume special significance against a backdrop of centuries of tsarist and Stalinist persecution. We strongly encourage you to continue to publicly condemn anti-Semitism whenever it manifests itself in the Russian Federation.

We also believe that it is important to back up the rhetoric of condemnation with the substance of action. Sad to say, physical violence against Jews still occurs in the Russian Federation. In Ryazan last year, youths attacked a Jewish Sunday school, threatening teachers and children and later intimidated school officials into revoking the Jewish community's use of a classroom. Rhetorical anti-Semitism also continues. In July anti-Semitism played a minor role in the gubernatorial race in Ryazan and has also played a role in gubernatorial elections in Krasnodar.

Radical extremists continue to operate openly in more than half of Russia's 89 regions. While most of these organizations are small, there is also little social or governmental opposition to them. There are at least ten ultra-nationalist groups in Russia with memberships between 100 and 5,000 members each. Anti-Semitism is a staple of most ultra-nationalist groups and is evident in the publication of the groups' periodicals. At least 37 newspapers and magazines of ultra-nationalist bent published anti-Semitic materials in 2000.

The year 2000 witnessed increasing cooperation between Russian extremists and their ideological counterparts abroad. The most notorious example of such cooperation was that of David Duke, the U.S. white supremacist, who visited Russia twice during the year. Duke's most recent anti-Semitic tract was prepared exclusively for the Russian market.

We recognize that you have made important statements in response to manifestations of anti-Semitism, and that law enforcement has in some cases been effective in investigating and prosecuting the perpetrators of anti-Semitic violence and crimes. More consistent and comprehensive implementation of your government's policies and of Russian laws would represent a significant improvement in this area. The United States Senate supports efforts to promote public awareness and training programs within the Russian Federation. We would welcome additional ways for the American involvement and cooperation in these efforts.

As members of the Senate we have sent you or your predecessor a similar letter for the past three years. We continue to believe it vital that you continue to demonstrate, through your emphatic disagreement with those who espouse anti-Semitism in Russia, the importance the Russian government places upon religious freedom. The United States predicates its support for democratic institutions in Russia upon unwavering opposition to anti-Semitism at any level, in any form.

We hope you share our deep concern for this issue and look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Joe Biden, Gordon H. Smith, Evan Bayh, Bob Smith, Mitch McConnell, Charles Schumer, John McCain, Herb Kohl, John Warner, Barbara Boxer, Jesse Helms, Debbie Stabenow, Orrin Hatch, Olympia Snowe, Don Nickles, Joe Lieberman, Arlen Specter, Mike Crapo, Max Cleland, Zell Miller, Ted Kennedy, Chris Dodd, Robert G. Torricelli, John Edwards, Daniel K. Akaka, Byron L. Dorgan, Paul Sarbanes, Dianne Feinstein, Jack Reed, Jon S. Corzine, George V. Voinovich, Tim Johnson, Kent Conrad, Tim Hutchinson, Peter G. Fitzgerald, Dick Durbin, Patty Murray, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Carl Levin, Jeff Bingaman, Daniel K. Inouye, Russ Feingold, Dick Lugar, Rick Santorum, Blanche L. Lincoln, John F. Kerry, Mike DeWine, Larry E. Craig.

Bill Frist, Patrick Leahy, Mark Dayton, Fritz Hollings, Max Baucus, Robert C. Byrd, Jean Carnahan, Tom Carper, Ron Wyden, Harry Reid, Jay Rockefeller, John Breaux, Mary L. Landrieu, E. Benjamin Nelson, Maria Cantwell, Bill Nelson, Barbara A. Mikulski, Tom Harkin, Bob Graham, James M. Jeffords, Paul D. Wellstone, Tom Daschle, John Ensign, Jeff Sessions, Richard Shelby, Conrad Burns, Craig Thomas, Pete V. Domenici, Chuck Grassley, Sam Brownback.

Jim Bunning, Frank H. Murkowski, Robert F. Bennett, Wayne Allard, George Allen, Strom Thurmond, Michael B. Enzi, Susan Collins, Kit Bond, Phil Gramm, Lincoln Chafee, Trent Lott, Jim Inhofe, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Thad Cochran, Pat Roberts, Jon Kyle, Ted Stevens, Judd Gregg.

The amendments (Nos. 1940 and 1941) were agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I see the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, in the Chamber. He would be recognized next, but while he is preparing his papers, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1949

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, earlier today I came to this Chamber and notified the manager on the Republican side and staff for Senator LEAHY that I intended to offer a resolution as an amendment. I believe I saw Senator LEAHY in this Chamber a moment ago. At this time, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] proposes an amendment numbered 1949.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To urge the Senate, prior to the end of the first session of the 107th Congress, to vote on at least the judicial nominations sent to the Senate by the President prior to August 4, 2001)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

The Senate finds that:

Currently 106 Federal judgeships are vacant, representing 12.3 percent of the Federal judiciary;

40 of those vacancies have been declared "judicial emergencies" by the Administrative Office of the Courts;

Last year, at the adjournment of the 106th Congress, 67 vacancies existed, representing 7.9 percent of the judiciary;

In May 2000, when there were 76 Federal judicial vacancies, Senator Daschle stated, "The failure to fill these vacancies is straining our Federal court system and delaying justice for people all across this country";

In January 1998, when there were 82 Federal judicial vacancies, Senator Leahy stated, "Any week in which the Senate does not confirm three judges is a week in which the Senate is failing to address the vacancy crisis";

The events of September 11, 2001, make it more important than ever that the branches of the Federal Government should operate at maximum efficiency which requires the Federal judiciary to be as close to full strength as possible;

100 percent of President Reagan's judicial nominees sent to the Senate prior to the 1981 August recess were confirmed during his first year in office;

100 percent of President George H.W. Bush's judicial nominees sent to the Senate prior to the 1989 August recess were confirmed during his first year in office;

93 percent of President Clinton's judicial nominees sent to the Senate prior to the 1993 August recess were confirmed during his first year in office;

President George W. Bush nominated and sent to the Senate 44 judicial nominees prior to the 2001 August recess;

21 of all pending nominees have been nominated to fill "judicial emergencies"; and

The Senate has confirmed only 8 judicial nominees to date, which represents 18 percent of President Bush's judicial nominations sent to the Senate prior to the 2001 August recess;

It is the sense of the Senate that (1) prior to the end of the first session of the 107th Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary shall hold hearings on, and the Committee on the Judiciary and the full Senate shall have votes on, at a minimum, the judicial nominations sent to the Senate by the President prior to August 4, 2001, and (2) the standard for approving pre-August recess judicial nominations for past administrations should be the standard for this and future administrations regardless of political party.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, the resolution calls for a sense of the Senate that all of the nominations submitted by President Bush to the Senate for the Federal judiciary prior to August 4, which was the start of the August recess, be considered by the Senate before the close of the first session of the 107th Congress.

There has been considerable concern and controversy over the number of judges which have been confirmed. And there had been a form of a filibuster engaged in on opposing the motion to proceed to the foreign operations appropriations bill last week and again yesterday.

That effort has not been pursued. It is my view that in the long run it is not productive to stop legislation as a pressure tactic, although that is a longstanding practice in the Senate by both parties. But in any event, that is not being pursued.

This resolution seeks to establish a standard which would be applicable not only to the occasions when a Republican President submits nominations to a Senate controlled by Democrats, but also to situations where there is a President who is a Democrat who submits nominations to a Senate which is controlled by Republicans.

I had written to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, on October 12, enclosing for him a first draft of this resolution and advising him in his capacity as chairman of the Judiciary Committee that I intended to raise it at the Judiciary Committee meeting first in order to give the Judiciary Committee the first opportunity to act on it. It was on the agenda for last Thursday, October 18, when it was considered and, on a party-line vote, voted down.

This is the first opportunity there has been to submit the resolution for consideration by the full Senate, which I am doing at this time.

Before proceeding to the merits of the resolution, I am going to yield the floor and wait for the arrival of the Senator from Vermont, who is also chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee and is the manager for the Democrats.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPECTER. I will.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, he need not wait for Senator LEAHY. He is aware that the Senator has offered this amendment. The Senator should say whatever he has to say.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from Nevada for saying that. I wanted to give him the courtesy of awaiting his arrival. I did see him momentarily, just about a minute and a half before I took the floor. With the comment by the assistant majority leader, I shall proceed to make an argument.

The resolution recites the facts that there are currently 106 Federal judicial vacancies, representing more than 12 percent of the Federal judiciary. Forty of these vacancies have been declared judicial emergencies by the Administrative Office of the Federal Courts. What that means is that there is an urgent need for judges to be sitting in those courts.

Last year at the adjournment of the 107th Congress, there were 67 vacancies, representing 7.9 percent of the Federal judiciary. It is obvious that

the vacancies now are more than 50-percent higher than they were when the 106th Congress adjourned.

When Senator DASCHLE was the Democratic leader and not in the majority in May of 2000, when there were 76 Federal judicial vacancies, Senator DASCHLE said, as set forth in this resolution:

The failure to fill these vacancies is straining our Federal court system and delaying justice for people all across the country.

In January of 1998, when there were 82 Federal judicial vacancies, Senator LEAHY stated—again set forth in the body of the resolution:

Any week in which the Senate does not confirm three judges is a week in which the Senate is failing to address the vacancy crisis.

The events of September 11 of this year, when the terrorists attacked New York City, the Pentagon, and Somerset County, PA, make it all the more imperative that all branches of the Federal Government shall operate at maximum efficiency, which requires the Federal judiciary to be as close to full strength as possible.

As analogous here, the first year of President Reagan's administration, 100 percent of all judicial nominees sent to the Senate prior to the August 1981 recess were confirmed during his first year in office. During the first year in office of President George H.W. Bush, 1989, again, 100 percent of the nominations sent prior to the August recess were confirmed. During President Clinton's first year in office, in 1993, 93 percent of the vacancies were filled during the first year in office. President George W. Bush this year has nominated and sent to the Senate 44 judicial nominees prior to the August 2001 recess. Twenty-one of all pending nominees have been nominated to fill "judicial emergencies."

The Senate has confirmed only twelve judicial nominees to date, which represent 27 percent of President Bush's judicial nominees sent to the Senate prior to the August 4 recess.

The resolution calls for the sense of the Senate that prior to the end of the first session of the 107th Congress, which will be sometime before the end of 2001, that all of the nominees sent prior to August 4 be acted upon by the Judiciary Committee, sent to the Senate, and voted on one way or another, up or down, further that the standard for approving all of the nominees submitted prior to the August recess be a standard policy of the U.S. Senate which would apply in future years and apply in future circumstances where there was a President who was a Democrat and a Senate controlled by Republicans.

During the course of our discussion during the Judiciary Committee meeting last Thursday, the issue was raised by one of the Senators who was a Democrat that this position was taken contrary to what it was in prior years. I said that I would modify the resolution to apply equally to times when there

was a Democrat who was President and a Republican-controlled Senate.

It is a rather straightforward resolution. That is the essence of the argument.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, this matter was raised in the Judiciary Committee. It was tabled. We have for 3 weeks been experiencing a filibuster in the Senate based on these same issues. That ended yesterday. Thankfully, we are now on this legislation.

The record is replete about Chairman LEAHY doing the very best he can under extremely difficult circumstances. We are going to move judges as quickly as we can under the direction of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Based upon that, I raise a point of order against the amendment that the amendment is not germane under rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I am informed that there was a typographical error in the resolution and that the figure 8 judicial nominees should have been 12, which represents 27 percent of President Bush's judicial nominees sent to the President prior to August 4, 2001. I wanted to make sure the record was accurate in that respect.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I do not intend to appeal the ruling of the Chair because I do not wish to establish a precedent for nongermane amendments to be heard on appropriations bills. This has been a procedural quagmire which has been very problematic for the Senate for a very long time and has a special impact on my own views, since I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. I regret that the issue of germaneness was raised and a point of order was raised, but I thought it was important to put this resolution before the body. I do believe it is the appropriate way to establish a standard—much preferable to having a filibuster and trying to block

the work of the Senate to establish a standard which would apply to both parties or both sides that a very reasonable cutoff date is the August recess. This year it started on August 4. Now the matter was considered in the Judiciary Committee. It was not tabled. There was a vote on the merits; not that that makes a lot of difference, it was 10-9.

But with the point of order having been raised by the assistant majority leader, there may be some political evaluation by the electorate of the position taken by the Democrats on this issue. It is not an unusual practice to have amendments offered on the Senate floor, and those who oppose them will have to explain them to their constituencies. It is my hope that those who have opposed this standard that all judges be voted on when submitted prior to the August recess, that they will have to explain that to their constituency.

The point of order having been raised by the assistant majority leader for the Democrats, not being considered on the merits, being defeated, we will just take it to the electorate for whatever consideration they may wish to give.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. REID. First of all, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Pennsylvania for not appealing the ruling of the Chair. The Senator, as has been indicated, is a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, and the precedent this would set if the Chair would overrule makes appropriations bills almost unmanageable. So the Senator from Pennsylvania has knowledge of the needs of the Senate compared to the issue he feels strongly about—and I know how strongly he feels about it. I appreciate the Senator not appealing the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, it is my intention to send to the desk an amendment that will restore the funding recommended by the President for the Andean Regional Counterdrug Initiative. I consider this to be a central issue in the U.S. relationship with our neighbors in Latin America, but maybe even at this time a more important statement as to our commitment to the war against terrorism.

To develop these points, I want to first give a brief resume of the history of this region over the past several years. By the late 1990s, Colombia and the Andean region were nations in peril and at risk. Colombia had been one of the most stable countries in Latin America during most of the 20th century. It had a phenomenal economic record, with some 50 years of unbroken increases in its rate of gross domestic product growth. It also was the oldest democracy on the continent of South America, with a long tradition of transition of power from one political party to the other without violence.

Unfortunately, it was also a region which had been infected by strong

guerrilla groups. These guerrilla groups had their origin in various nuances of Marxism. They were guerrillas who represented Soviet Marxism, guerrillas who represented East German Marxism, Chinese Marxism, North Korean Marxism, Cuban Marxism. They were ideologically oriented.

Over time, they had become less political and more economic. They had made the transition from being Lenin to being Al Capone in their orientation.

Something else was developing in the countries in the Andean region during the last half of the 20th century, and that was a surge of illicit drug production, starting with marijuana and then moving to cocaine, with a very high percentage of the world's cocaine being produced in this region.

The drug traffickers who were producing cocaine were of the General Motors format: They were highly centralized. They had a CEO. They had a vertically integrated process that started by financing the farmers who grow the raw coca to the ultimate distribution and financing of that system in the United States and Europe.

We made a major effort—we, the civilized world, with the United States playing a key role—to take down these highly centralized drug organizations—the Medellin cartel, the Cali cartel. After a long period of significant investment and loss of life, we were successful. We thought that by taking off the head of the snake of the drug cartels we would kill the rest of the body.

In fact, what we found in the late 1990s was that these decapitated snakes were beginning to reconstitute themselves, and they were moving away from the General Motors model towards a more entrepreneurial model; whereas they used to have vertically integrated parts of the drug trafficking chain, now they have multiple small drug traffickers doing each phase, from the growing in the field, to the transporting, to the financing of the drug trade.

For a period of time, these new entrepreneurial drug traffickers found themselves at risk because they did not have the kind of security protection that the old centralized system had, and so they turned to these now economic guerrillas, the Al Capones of Colombia, and made a pact with them. The pact was: We will pay you well if you will provide us security so that we can conduct our illicit activities.

For a while, that was the relationship, but then the Al Capones figured out: We are providing the reason and the capability of these drug traffickers to do their business. They are making a lot more money in drug trafficking than we are providing the security for the drug traffickers; why don't we become the drug traffickers ourselves?

By the end of the nineties, the drug trade, in particular in Colombia, had been largely taken over by the former ideological guerrillas who had become Al Capones and now were becoming drug traffickers.

In addition to the two things I have indicated were occurring, the change in the way in which the drug trade was organized and, second, the role of the guerrillas in the drug trade, a third thing was occurring in the late 1990s, and that was, after this long unbroken period of economic progress and the benefits that was providing for the people of the Andean region, particularly Colombia, they started to go into economic decline.

The two previous events were a principal reason for that decline: Both domestic and outside investors became leery about investing in Colombia and other Andean pact countries because of their concern about the level of violence and the influence the drug trade was gaining over those countries.

Just 18 months ago, unemployment in Colombia exceeded 20 percent as many of its traditional legal businesses went out of business.

Into this very difficult environment came a new leader for Colombia: President Pastrana. President Pastrana was not a person who was unknowing or immune from these forces that were shaping his country. He himself had been kidnapped by the guerrillas and held for a considerable period of time. Members of his family had been kidnapped and assassinated by the guerrillas. He was elected on a reform platform that he was going to, as the hallmark of his administration, lean toward a resolution of all three of these issues: The guerrillas, the drug trafficking, and begin to build a base for a new period of economic expansion.

The key to this became Plan Colombia which President Pastrana developed early in his administration. Plan Colombia is a very misunderstood concept, particularly from the perspective of the United States. I like to present it as being a jigsaw puzzle with 10 pieces. That total puzzle, once assembled, was a comprehensive plan to rid Colombia of the influence of the guerrillas, to suppress the drug trafficking and large-scale production of cocaine, and to engage in social and economic and political reform within Colombia, to transform Colombia into a fully functioning, modern, democratic, capitalistic nation state.

Of those 10 pieces that made up that total picture of Plan Colombia, the Colombians were going to be responsible for 5 of those 10 pieces.

The total cost of Plan Colombia was estimated at \$8 billion, and the Colombian Government was going to pay for \$4 billion. They raised taxes, made adjustments in their budget, and did other things to get prepared to accept their 50-percent share of this plan.

The other 50 percent was going to be divided between the United States, which would assume approximately 20 percent of the cost of Plan Colombia, and the rest of the international community, which was to assume 30 percent of the cost.

When the decisions were being made as to what parts of that international

effort should be the U.S. component, the decision was made that most of our responsibility was going to be on the military side.

Why was that? The reason was, because a key part of a successful attack against the drug traffickers and since, in many instances, drug traffickers and guerrillas were the same people in the same uniform, the United States had the best ability to provide the intelligence the Colombian military would need to use its forces as effectively as possible.

We had the ability to provide the training that the Colombian military needed to increase its professionalism, and particularly to deal with issues such as the long history of human rights abuses within the military of Colombia, and we also could provide some of the equipment the Colombian military needed, specifically helicopters, to give the Colombian military greater mobility so that when they identified through intelligence where there was a drug activity that was susceptible to being attacked, they would be able to deliver the troops and the materials necessary to successfully carry out that attack.

I go into this in some detail because, for Americans, there has been a tendency to assume that since our component of Plan Colombia was heavily oriented toward military activities, that described the totality of Plan Colombia. That is not quite the fact.

The fact is the totality of Plan Colombia was a balanced plan that had social, economic, political components, as well as law enforcement and military components. It just happened that because we were in the best position to provide the military components, that was where most of our part of Plan Colombia happened to fall.

Plan Colombia was presented to the Congress in 2000, and in the summer of 2000 the Congress voted to provide as the first installment towards our commitment to Plan Colombia \$1.3 billion. We also committed we would have follow-on commitments to Plan Colombia as the progress of this effort to fight the three ills of Colombia: The guerrillas, the drug traffickers, and the economic decline.

President Bush has continued the Plan Colombia commitment which had been made by President Clinton. He has recommended to us that we appropriate \$731 million. His plan substantially broadens the commitment from a primary focus on Colombia, which was the focus of the first year of the plan under President Clinton's leadership, to a regional focus.

The funds, as proposed by President Bush, are roughly evenly divided between Colombia on the one hand and the other Andean pact countries that are beneficiaries, which are Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia. President Bush also recommended that of the 50 percent to go to Colombia, that should also be divided roughly 50/50 between law enforcement and military on the one side

and economic and social development on the other.

Part of the reason for that recommendation was the fact it has been thus far difficult to get the other components of the international community, with a few major exceptions, Spain and Great Britain being two of those exceptions, to fully participate as had been anticipated in Plan Colombia. So we are now, in addition to our original area of principal responsibility, becoming more engaged in the social and economic development aspects of this now Andean legislative initiative.

The reason I am speaking this afternoon is the Foreign Operations Subcommittee rejected much of what President Bush had recommended, and they recommended the \$731 million be cut by 22 percent, or to \$567 million. That cut will have serious implications on the United States and our relationship with this region and the future of this region, and our commitments we are making today towards the fight against terrorism around the world.

To be specific, what are some of the implications of a 22-percent cut in the now Andean Regional Counterdrug Initiative? Let me start with the country that has been our principal focus and would be the recipient of half of these funds: The Republic of Colombia. Support for the Colombian National Police interdiction and eradication effort would be reduced because there would be less funding for spare parts for the equipment we provided and fuel to operate the equipment. This would make coca reduction targets less likely to be attained. The failure to attain those coca reduction targets means there will be more cocaine in the streets of the United States of America, afflicting the people of this Nation.

A second result will be security for government officials, which the military provides in high conflict areas, will also be reduced, making the police and alternative development workers even more vulnerable.

Last week there was a meeting held in Washington of an organization in which several members of this body participate called the Inter-American Legislative Network. The purpose of this organization is to encourage the full development of the parliaments and congresses of the nations of the Western Hemisphere on the belief if they are truly going to have a democratic society, the institution in which we serve is a critical component of that society.

We started our meeting last Tuesday with a period of silence. That period of silence was in recognition of the fact two legislators from Colombia had been assassinated the week before we met, illustrative of the level of violence which is being directed towards the democratic institutions by the assassination of the members of democratic institutions in Colombia.

A third effect of this cut will be the Colombian alternative development

program will be restricted, and the success we have had to date of signing up farmers who have been producing illicit coca to start producing legal crops will be substantially hampered, and our ability to comply with commitments we have already made will be restricted.

Next, programs to strengthen democratic institutions such as the judiciary and witness protection will also be reduced because of less funds available to support those programs. Lowered support for the police and military would also call into question our political support for Colombia, which might undermine the progress that has been made to date in human rights.

Finally, in the next year a new President will be elected in Colombia. They have a one-term limit on their Presidents. So President Pastrana could not run for reelection. There is an active campaign underway to elect his successors, and the candidates for the Presidential election which will occur next spring might raise questions as to the reliability of United States support, particularly during this difficult and significant period in the history of Colombia.

The consequences both within Colombia and on the U.S.-Colombian relationship of this proposed reduction are dire, but the implications are not limited to Colombia because, as I indicated, half of this money will now go to the other countries, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia.

Speaking of Peru, where there has been a very aggressive alternative development program which has been enormously successful, 15 years ago most of the coca produced in the world was produced in either Peru or Bolivia and then was transported to Colombia for processing into cocaine. That level of production in Peru and Bolivia has been dramatically reduced. That reduction has, in large part, been because we have been encouraging the farmers to do the same thing we hoped to accomplish in Colombia, which is to transition to legal crops.

We had no funding for that alternative development program in either fiscal year 2000 or 2001 because of our concerns about President Fujimori. As we know, President Fujimori was forced out of the country. He is now living in exile. A new President, President Toledo, has been elected and had been anticipating we would resume the level of support we have been giving to Peru. That support is now at risk. Failure to support Peru in this area of alternative development will undermine the hopeful flourishing of democracy that will come to Peru under the leadership of President Toledo.

Similarly, Brazil's success is also being challenged as a new President takes office. Planting of coca is beginning to occur in the Champara region, which was the principal area of coca production in Bolivia. We need to help the new Government continue to enforce the coca ban and to offer further

alternative development assistance, not to retreat as this subcommittee recommendation would have us do.

Ecuador is also vulnerable to cuts as we seek to maintain enforcement and foster community development, particularly in the northern border region adjacent to Colombia's major coca cultivation zones. Ecuador, which is one of the poorer countries of Latin America, has a long border with Colombia which is immediately adjacent to the area where the principal guerilla group called the FARC in Colombia operates, and the area where we have been putting the principal focus of our coca eradication.

There has been a great deal of cross-border activity, and Ecuador has been looking to us to give them some assistance in maintaining the sanctity of their borders so they can maintain what has been a surprisingly effective effort to avoid substantial coca production in Ecuador. Brazil, Panama, and Venezuela also have modest enforcement programs which need support to have a chance to overcome the efforts of traffickers to transit drugs and corrupt local governments.

The whole Andean region is a region at risk. I suggest we are sending exactly the wrong signal of our awareness of that risk and our willingness to be a good partner at a time of need by this 22-percent cut in our program of assistance to the Andean region.

The proposed Andean Regional Counterdrug Initiative, in my opinion, is an integrated, balanced package. There are proposals now, even with those funds that are left, to earmark those funds in ways that will not be consistent with an integrated effort in the Andean region. Earmarking funds for non-Colombian programs will increase the likelihood of failure and increased violence in Colombia, the largest coca producer in the world. As indicated, we are already proposing—the administration is proposing—to allocate these funds on a 50/50 basis between Colombia and the other Andean countries. The earmarking would change that rational balance.

Finally, following September 11, U.S. law enforcement and military resources which had been placed in the Andean region were withdrawn. Significant numbers of law enforcement personnel were withdrawn back to the United States to assist in homeland security. Many of the military personnel are now in central Asia. This regional effort, funded by foreign assistance, the effort we are considering today, represents the most significant remaining activity in the world to stem the flow of drugs into the United States. For those who say they want to fight drugs, this is the drug program in terms of reducing the supply into the United States. To cut it by almost a quarter will seriously curtail a program on the verge of success, with no alternative supply reduction strategy available. The consequences of this action are serious, immediate, but also with very long-range implications.

I close by asking this question: What is the message the United States of America is sending to our own citizens, what is the message we are sending to the world, when on October 24, 2001, we come before the Senate with a proposal to cut back on the only effective program we have in the world to reduce the flow of cocaine into the United States and one of the most important programs we have in the world to attack terrorists?

These are some of the messages. We are saying we are prepared to give up on the international effort to strengthen the forces of democracy, lawfulness, and future economic growth in a very important region for the United States. How do we ask a European country to make a commitment to support this region if we, who have much more immediate interests and so much more at risk, take the action being recommended today?

Second, are we giving up on Latin America? President Bush, when he came into office, and previously as Governor of Texas and as a candidate for the Presidency, emphasized the importance of the United States relations with Latin America. Unfortunately, we have yet to move forward on an effective program to influence our closest neighbors in the Western Hemisphere.

The one next to this program that is most important is to increase our trade relations. We have a 10-year program with the countries of the Andean region, called the Andean trade pact, whereby we have provided beneficial trade relations. That program will expire in early December. As of today, less than 60 days to expiration day, we have not moved in either the House Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee the legislation even to renew that program which is a vital part of the economic capacity of that region and particularly critical now as we are trying, for instance in the case of Colombia, to disemploy 400,000 people who are now working in illicit drug activities, and give them some opportunity to work in a legal, productive area of the economy. Yet we are about to see an important part of the pillar of that legal economy erode.

The irony is that much of the funding that has been stripped out of the Andean region has been diverted to, as I understand it, providing additional funds to the Export-Import Bank, the purpose of which is to increase our trade. Here we are with some of the best self-trading partners the United States has, a region of the world in which we have a positive trade balance, and we are undercutting its capacity so we can fund the Export-Import Bank whose purpose is to promote trade. That is ironic.

Third, I am concerned we are returning to neo-isolationism, and doing so at the very time when we need to be building strong international coalitions to prepare for the long-range war against terrorism.

That brings me to my final point. What is the message we are sending? A number of Members earlier today were asked to go to the White House to meet with the President, the Vice President, and other leaders of the administration and the newly appointed head of the Homeland Security Agency, Gov. Tom Ridge. At the end of the meeting, President Bush gave us a final challenge. I would like, to the best of my ability, to quote what he said in that final challenge. He asked this question: Do we really want to win the war against terrorism? His answer: Absolutely, and that it will require unity, that we must be prepared to act in different ways in order to win this war. We must be prepared to win it at home, and we must be prepared to win it at the source.

I agree with all of those challenges the President has given to the American people. But what is it going to say if, today, on October 24, some 6 weeks and 1 day after the tragedy of September 11, we strip away a substantial amount of the resources that are being used to fight one of the most virulent terrorist operations extant in the world? The FARC terrorists of Colombia.

In the year 2000 alone there were 423 terrorist attacks against U.S. interests by guerrillas in Colombia. Tell me that we are not fighting terrorism as we fight the source of funding for those terrorists, which is the drug trade in Colombia.

Of those 423 international terrorist acts against U.S. interests, over a third were in Colombia. Mr. President, 44 percent of all attacks against American interests in 2000 were conducted in the country of Colombia.

We have a war against terrorists. An important component of that war is not just 6 weeks old but now is several years old. We have made representations to the people of the United States, the people of Colombia, the people of the Andean region, that we were going to be a full partner in the successful pursuit of that war.

More recently, we have made similar representations to the people of Pakistan and to its leadership and to other countries around the world as we ask them to join the coalition for a long, protracted, difficult war to root out global terrorism wherever it exists in the world. I suggest our true commitment is not going to be judged by the words we speak but by the actions we take.

If we, today, accept a budget which strips 22 percent of the funds we have committed to an area which has become in many ways the global testing ground for our commitment against terrorism, I believe we will be sending a signal that will reverberate around the world, and one that will potentially substantially erode our credibility.

We have only had Plan Colombia now for a few days more than 12 months. It went into effect October 1 of 2000. Today is October 24 of 2001. Yet hardly

more than a year into this battle we are beginning to sound the trumpet of retreat and run up the white flag of surrender. That is not what America wants this Senate to say on its behalf. We want to say, as President Bush asked us: Are we really in this war to win? Absolutely. We will have a chance later today to decide whether we want to put an exclamation point behind the President's statement and commitment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a moment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. As long as I can regain the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. I sought the floor for the purpose of submitting the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] for himself, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 1950.

On page 142, line 17, strike "\$567,000,000" and insert "\$731,000,000, of which, \$164,000,000 shall be derived from reductions in amounts otherwise appropriated in this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will be relatively brief. I want to respond to my colleague from Florida.

First of all, the Senator from Florida is about as committed to this region of the world, and to the country of Colombia, as anybody in the Senate. I understand that. This is just a respectful difference of opinion we have.

The two members of the Colombian Congress my colleague spoke about were killed by paramilitaries, the AUC, not by the FARC or ELN, the guerrillas. Although I agree that the FARC and ELN are terrorist organizations and should be listed as such, so is the AUC, which is now listed as a terrorist organization. I will go into this in a moment because I think it is an important point.

There are reasons we do not want to put an additional \$71 million into this package without much more accountability when it comes to human rights and who is committing the violence.

I also want to point out that of the money we are talking about, the \$71 million, a lot of that money in this package goes to disaster relief, goes to refugees, goes to combating HIV/AIDS, goes to public health, goes to education. I think we are probably a lot better off in a foreign operations bill with these priorities than we are putting an additional \$71 million into this package.

I also have, which I think is very relevant to this debate, an EFE News, Spain piece, the headline of which is "Colombian Paramilitaries Kidnap 70 Farmers to Pick Coca Leaves."

The truth is, the FARC and ELN, these are not Robin Hood organizations; they are into narco-trafficking up

to their eyeballs. But so is the AUC and the paramilitary.

The problem is this effort, Plan Colombia, has been all too one-sided. If it was truly counternarcotics, we would see just as much effort by the Government and by the military focused on the AUC and their involvement in drug trafficking as we see vis-a-vis ELN and FARC. But we don't see that.

There are other reasons we can make better use of this \$71 million. Since we started funding Plan Colombia, unfortunately we have seen a dramatic increase in paramilitary participation.

By the way, let me also point out that on the whole question of the war against drugs, not only do I think we would be much better off spending money on reducing demand in our own country—there is a reason why Colombia exports 300 metric tons of cocaine to the United States every year or more, and that is because of the demand. We ought to get serious about reducing the demand in our own country. As long as there is demand, somebody is going to grow it and somebody is going to make money and you can fumigate here and fumigate there and it will just move from one place to another.

My colleague from Florida talked about this effective effort, but the United Nations, with a conservative methodology, pointed out that although 123,000 acres of coca plants have been fumigated under Plan Colombia, cultivation increased 11 percent last year. Cultivation increased 11 percent last year.

Senator FEINGOLD and I will have an amendment and we will talk about the fumigation and we will see where the social development money is that was supposed to come with the fumigation. That was supposed to be part of Plan Colombia. We are also going to be saying we ought to involve the local people who live in these communities in decisions that are made about this aerial spraying.

There are health and safety effects. We can raise those questions. But it is a little naive to believe these campesinos are not going to continue to grow coca if they are not given alternatives, and the social development money has just not been there.

What I want to focus on, which is why I am opposed to the Graham amendment, is the human rights issues. The ranks of the AUC and paramilitary groups continue to swell. The prime targets are human rights workers, trade unionists, drug prosecutors, journalists, and unfortunately two prominent legislators, murdered not by FARC or ELN but murdered by AUC, with the military having way too many ties—the military that we support—with the paramilitary at the brigade level.

I objected to such a huge infusion of military assistance to the Colombian security forces when civilian management remained weak, and the ties between the military and paramilitaries were so notorious and strong.

Since Plan Colombia funding began pouring into Colombia, we have seen a massive increase in paramilitary participation and its incumbent violence. The ranks of the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC) and other paramilitary groups continue to swell. Their prime targets: human rights workers, trade unionists, judges, prosecutors, journalists, and myriad other civilians.

The linkages between Colombia's security forces and paramilitary organizations are long and historic. Everybody agrees, including the Colombian Ministry of Defense, that the paramilitaries account for 75 percent of the killings in Colombia.

The media and international human rights groups continue to show evidence of tight links between the military and human rights violators within paramilitary groups.

The U.S. State Department, the U.N. High Commission on Human Rights, Amnesty International, and Human Rights Watch are among the organizations who have documented that the official Colombian military remains linked closely with paramilitaries and collaborates in the atrocities.

According to the Colombian Committee of Jurists (CCJ), "[i]n the case of the paramilitaries, one cannot underestimate the collaboration of government forces."

According to the International Labor Organization (ILO), the official Colombian military has in some cases created paramilitary units to carry out assassinations.

The State Department's September 2000 report itself mentions "credible allegations of cooperation with paramilitary groups, including instances of both silent support and direct collaboration by members of the armed forces."

Likewise, in its Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, released in February 2001, the State Department reported that "the number of victims of paramilitary attacks during the year increased." It goes on to say: "members of the security forces sometimes illegally collaborated with paramilitary forces. The armed forces and the police committed serious violations of human rights throughout the year."

More from State Department Reports:

The Government's human rights record remained poor; there were some improvements in the legal framework and in institutional mechanisms, but implementation lagged, and serious problems remain in many areas. Government security forces continued to commit serious abuses, including extrajudicial killings. Despite some prosecutions and convictions, the authorities rarely brought higher-ranking officers of the security forces and the police charged with human rights offenses to justice, and impunity remains a problem. Members of the security forces collaborated with paramilitary groups that committed abuses, in some instances allowing such groups to pass through roadblocks, sharing information, or providing them with supplies or ammunition. Despite

increased government efforts to combat and capture members of paramilitary groups, often security forces failed to take action to prevent paramilitary attacks. Paramilitary forces find a ready support base within the military and police, as well as among local civilian elites in many areas.

Two weeks ago, Human Rights Watch released a report titled "The 'Sixth Division': Military-Paramilitary Ties and U.S. Policy in Colombia." It contains charges that Colombian military and police detachments continue to promote, work with, support, profit from, and tolerate paramilitary groups, treating them as a force allied to and compatible with their own.

The "Sixth Division" is a phrase Colombians use to refer to paramilitary groups, seen to act as simply another part of the Colombian military. The Colombian Army has five divisions.

In the report, Human Rights Watch focuses on three Colombian Army brigades: the Twenty-Fourth, Third, and Fifth Brigades.

At their most brazen, the relationships described in this report involve active coordination during military operations between government and paramilitary units; communication via radios, cellular telephones, and beepers; the sharing of intelligence, including the names of suspected guerrilla collaborators; the sharing of fighters, including active-duty soldiers serving in paramilitary units and paramilitary commanders lodging on military bases; the sharing of vehicles, including army trucks used to transport paramilitary fighters; coordination of army roadblocks, which routinely let heavily-armed paramilitary fighters pass; and payments made from paramilitaries to military officers for their support.

President Andrés Pastrana has publicly deplored paramilitary atrocities. But the armed forces have yet to take the critical steps necessary to prevent future killings by suspending high ranking security force members suspected of supporting these abuses.

This failure has serious implications for Colombia's international military donors, especially the United States. So far, however, the United States has failed to fully acknowledge this situation, meaning that military units implicated in abuses continue to receive U.S. aid. Human Rights Watch contends that the United States has violated the spirit of its own laws and in some cases downplayed or ignored evidence of continuing ties between the Colombian military and paramilitary groups in order to fund Colombia's military and lobby for more aid, including to a unit implicated in a serious abuse.

Although some members of the military have been dismissed by President Pastrana, it appears that many military personnel responsible for egregious human rights violations continue to serve and receive promotions in the Colombian military.

For example, according to a Washington Office on Latin America, Amnesty International and Human Rights

Watch joint report, General Rodrigo Quinones, Commander of the Navy's First Brigade was linked to 57 murders of trade unionists, human rights workers and community leaders in 1991 and 1992. He also played a significant role in a February 2000 massacre. A civilian judge reviewing the case of one of his subordinates stated that Quinones' guilt was "irrefutable" and the judge could not understand how Quinones was acquitted in a military court. Nevertheless, he was promoted to General in June 2000.

According to the Colombian Attorney General's office, another general, Carlos Ospina Ovalle, commander of the Fourth Brigade, had extensive ties to military groups. He and his brigade were involved in the October 1997 El Aro massacre, wherein Colombian troops surrounded and maintained a perimeter around the village while residents were rounded up and four were executed. General Ospina Ovalle also was promoted.

In the State Department's January 2001 report Major Jesus Maria Clavijo was touted as an example of a successful detention of a military officer associated with the paramilitaries. Yet, by several NGO accounts he "remains on active duty and is working in military intelligence, an area that has often been used to maintain links to paramilitary groups."

Colombian and international human rights defenders are under increased surveillance, intimidation, and threats of attack by paramilitary groups.

According to a recent Amnesty International press release, two men identifying themselves as members of a paramilitary group approached members of Peace Brigades International, threatened them with a gun and declared PBI to be a "military target."

Members of Colombian human rights groups such as the Association of Family Members of the Detained and Disappeared and the Regional Corporation for the Defense of Human Rights have been "disappeared," murdered in their homes and harassed with death threats. Despite reports to the military and requests for help, Colombian authorities seemingly have failed to take significant steps on behalf of the human rights groups.

The systematic, mass killing of union leaders and their members by paramilitaries in Colombia can only be described as genocide. There has been a dramatic escalation in violations against them—kidnapping, torture, and murder—and the response by the Colombian authorities in the face of this crisis has been negligible.

These attacks are an affront to the universally recognized right to organize.

One hundred and thirty-five trade unionists, both leaders and members, were assassinated during the year, bringing the total number of trade unionists killed since 1991 to several thousand. At least another 1,600 others have received death threats over the last three years, including 180 in 2000; 37 were unfairly arrested and 155 had to flee their home

region. A further 24 were abducted, 17 disappeared and 14 were the victims of physical attacks. (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions—10 October 2001. Colombia: Annual Survey of Violations of Trade Union Rights—2001).

I would like to share this quote with my colleagues; it will reveal the true nature of the situation in Colombia. The quote is attributed to Carlo Castaño, head of the AUC, the largest paramilitary group in Colombia: "We have reasons for killing all those we do. In the case of trade unionists, we kill them because they prevent others from working."

Most of the union killings have been carried out by Castano's AUC, because they view union organizers as subversives. One of the most recent killings occurred on June 21, when the leader of Sinaltrainal—the union that represents Colombia Coca-Cola workers—Oscar Dario Soto Polo was gunned down. His murder brings to seven the number of unionists who worked for Coca-Cola and were targeted and killed by paramilitaries.

I recently met with the new leader of Sinaltrainal, Javier Correa. In our meeting, he described the daily threats to his life, and the extremely dangerous conditions he and his family are forced to endure. In his quiet, gentle manner he told me about the kidnapping of his 3-year-old son and his mother, both at the hands of the paramilitaries. Frankly, I fear for his life and that of his family. In the wake of this meeting, I dread news from the Colombian press, mainly out of fear of what I may read.

In response to these threats, the United Steelworkers of America recently sued Coca-Cola in Federal court for its role in such violent attacks on labor, and other large corporations are being investigated.

According to the International Labor Organization (ILO), the vast majority of trade union murders are committed by either the Colombian state itself—e.g. army, police and DAS (security department)—or its indirect agents, the right-wing paramilitaries.

On both of my visits to Colombia, I heard repeated reports of military-paramilitary collusion throughout the country, including in the southern departments of Valle, Cauca, and Putamayo, as well as in the city of Barrancabermeja, which I visited in December and March.

Consistently, the military, in particular the army, was described to me as tolerating, supporting, and actively coordinating paramilitary operations, which often ended in massacres. I was also told that too often detailed information was supplied to the military and other authorities about the whereabouts of armed groups, the location of their bases, and yet authorities were unwilling or unable to take measures to protect the civilian population or to pursue their attackers.

While in Colombia, I discussed with General Carreno the status and location of the San Rafael—de Lebrija—paramilitary base. The base is operating openly in an area under his command, and its activities have directly

caused much of the bloodshed in the region. Almost 7 months after our meeting, however, no effective action has been taken to curtail the operations of the San Rafael paramilitary base, and that it remains open for business.

The Colombian military knows where the base is, and who operates it. The Colombian government knows. I know, for heaven's sake. But, just in case they don't know, I will tell them here. The base is on the Magdalena River about 130 kilometers north of Barrancabermeja on the same side of the River as Barranca, northwest of the Municipio of Rio Negro, in the Department of Santander.

It is from San Rafael de Lebrija that the paramilitaries launch their operations to dominate the local governments and the local community organizations in the area around and including Barrancabermeja. It is there that they organize their paramilitary operations of intimidations of the citizens of the area including the attacks on Barrancabermeja.

It is from there that they stage the murder of innocent civilians like Alma Rosa Jaramillo and Eduardo Estrada. These brave volunteers were brutally assassinated in July, simply because they stand for democracy, civil rights, and human rights. They are against the war, and have no enemies in the conflict. They were both leaders in the Program of Development and Peace of the Magdalena Medio, located in Barranca, lead by my friend Father "Pacho" Francisco De Roux.

I call on the Colombian government and military to show the U.S. Senate that they are serious about cracking down on paramilitaries.

Close San Rafael. Close Miraflores and Simón Bolívar, also located in Barranca, in the northeast quadrant of the city. Close San Blas, south of the Municipio of Simiti near San Pablo in the South of the Department of Bolívar. Close Hacienda Villa Sandra, a base about one mile north of Puerto Asís, the largest town in Putumayo. Is this too much to ask?

From the annual report on Colombia, by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (Organization of American States—year 2000) (The OAS on paramilitary bases):

... observations ... confirm that the free operation of patrol checks, paramilitary bases and acts perpetrated by the AUC in the areas of Putumayo (La Hormiga, La Dorada, San Miguel, Puerto Asís, Santa Ana), Antioquia (El Jordán, San Carlos), y Valle (La Iberia, Tuluá) are being investigated mainly in the disciplinary jurisdiction.

It further says:

The Commission is particularly troubled by the situation in Barrancabermeja, Department of Santander. Complaints are periodically received concerning paramilitary incursions and the establishment of new paramilitary camps in the urban districts. The complaints report that even though civilian and military authorities have been alerted, paramilitary groups belonging to the AUC have settled in the Miraflores and Simón Bolívar districts in the northeast

quadrant of the city, and have spread to another 32 districts in the southern, southeastern, northern and northeastern sectors.

Arrest the notorious paramilitary leaders who open and sustain these bases. Nearly everyone knows who they are, where they operate. I know, and I've only been to Colombia twice.

They are operated by the AUC, led by the likes of Carlos Castaño, Julian Duque, Alexander "El Zarco" Londono, Gabriel Salvatore "El Mono" Mancuso Gomez, and Ramon Isaza Arango.

The men on this short list—a mere five paramilitaries—account for over 40 arrest warrants over several years. They are responsible for untold cases of kidnapping, torture, and murder. Go get them.

In its annual report on Columbia, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (Organization of American States—year 2000) addressed the problem of paramilitary groups and their bases of operations. Here is what they said:

The Commission must point out ... that although the human rights violations committed by paramilitary are frequently investigated by the regular courts, in many cases, the arrest warrants the courts issue are not executed, especially when they involve the upper echelons of the AUC and the intellectual authors. This creates a climate of impunity and fear. A case in point is the fact that in 2000, the highest ranking chief of the AUC, Carlos Castaño, has had access to the national and international media and contacts at the ministerial level, yet the numerous arrest warrants against him for serious human rights violations, have never been executed.

The Colombian government seems to have accepted paramilitary take overs, in places like Barranca. The Colombian government and military must find a way to respond to the paramilitary threat. It is a threat to the rights of free speech, free assembly, and moreover, the rule of law in Colombia.

Mr. President, as I have said all along, if we are really serious about counter-narcotics we should strongly encourage the Colombian government to act boldly and officially in response to the increasing strength of the paramilitaries, who are actively engaged in narco-trafficking.

Carlos Castaño has admitted that about 70 percent of his organization's revenues come from taxing drug traffickers. He is listed as a major Colombian drug trafficker in recent documents of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency.

Drug trafficking is a lucrative business for all parties involved in the Colombian conflict. The fact is, many military personnel are finding that paramilitary work is simply more lucrative than military pay. In addition, they are not forced to comply with even the minimum in standards for conduct. Yet, this begets another crucial question: where do all these vetted officers and soldiers end up? I fear the answer again lies in the paramilitaries. After all, their ranks have swelled dramatically in recent years.

To date, the debate surrounding Plan Colombia has been disingenuous. Why has there been little effort to combat paramilitary drug lords? I'm afraid we may be exposing this plan for what it really is; counterinsurgency against the leftist guerrillas, rather than a sincere effort to stop the flow of drugs. A recent Rand report suggested that the U.S. government should abandon this charade, in favor of an all-out military offensive on guerrilla forces.

Lamentably, I do not see any improvement on the rule of law front. Since Plan Colombia started, and the requisite oversight, we have witnessed an unprecedented increase in the power and authority of a Colombian military with a long history of corruption and abuse.

Last summer, President Pastrana signed a new national security law that gives the Colombian military sweeping new powers. Among other things, the law allows military commanders to declare martial law in combat zones, suspending powers of civilian authorities and some constitutional protections afforded civilians. The law also shortens the period for carrying out human rights investigations of police and army troops, allowing soldiers to assume some of the tasks that had been assigned to civilian investigators.

Other controversial aspects of the law are provisions that allow the military to hold suspects for longer periods before turning them over to civilian judges. Under the old law, government troops had to free suspected drug traffickers and guerrillas if they were unable to turn them over to civilian authorities within 36 hours. I am very concerned about the implications of these provisions. Like many, I fear that torture or other human rights violations may increase as a result.

The U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights in Colombia believes, as I do, that some of the provisions of the law are either unconstitutional or violate international human rights treaties. I have conveyed my objections about this law to the Colombian government. By pouring another \$135 million into the coffers of the Colombian military, we will be increasing their power further without adequately strengthening checks on military abuses. Frankly, I feel this is the wrong direction.

I am pleased that my colleagues, especially Senator LEAHY, have fought to attach safeguards to U.S. military aid to ensure that the Colombian armed forces are: First, cooperating fully with civilian authorities, in prosecuting and punishing in civilian courts those members credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights or aided or abetted paramilitary groups; second, severing links, including intelligence sharing, at the command, battalion, and brigade levels, with paramilitary groups, and executing outstanding arrest warrants for members of such groups; and third, investigating attacks against human

rights defenders, trade unionists, and government prosecutors, investigators and civilian judicial officials, and bringing the alleged perpetrators to justice.

Moreover, the paramilitaries undermine the peace process. How can guerrillas—be they ELN or FARC—agree with the government about future political inclusion in the context of a cease fire without first defining the problem of paramilitary groups?

In early 2001, President Pastrana agreed to create a DMZ for the ELN in the northern state of Bolivar. This backfired badly when ELN rebels were chased out by members of the paramilitary group Autodefensas Unidas de Colombia, AUC. The ELN subsequently pulled out of the peace process.

Frustration with the peace process on the part of the military and the country's elites has helped transform the paramilitary AUC into a major player in the conflict. Some estimates of the strength and size of the AUC are as high as 9,500 fighters. In my view, this resurgence can be directly linked to the flawed peace process.

The AUC poses a real threat to the FARC and the ELN, who may now be forced to co-operate with each other more closely. That is bad news for the security situation, particularly given the boost it could provide to the weaker ELN.

What's even more telling is the trend of FARC guerrillas joining the ranks of the paramilitaries. Their motives are based on greed. Paramilitaries, financed by narcotraffickers, are now using ex-guerrillas as scouts and officers, to combat the FARC and ELN more forcefully. This amounts to a deadly coalition. The narcotraffickers have money without limits, the paramilitaries use violence without scruples, and the military supplies inside information and protection.

Press reports detailing U.S. reluctance to participate, even as an observer, in peace talks between President Pastrana and FARC leaders only serve to increase my concerns. All sides need to encourage a continued dialogue among all sectors of civil society, but the escalating violence makes that increasingly impossible.

Some of my colleagues have argued that the present campaign against terrorism merits our continued military involvement in Colombia. These funds, it is said, are going toward counter-narcotics operations, targeting the FARC and ELN, both of which are on the State Department's terrorist list.

I am well aware that paramilitary groups are not the only armed actors committing human rights violations in Colombia, and I am no friend of these guerrilla movements. In fact, I have consistently decried their repressive tactics and blatant disregard for international human rights standards.

I was deeply saddened by recent reports from Colombia which suggest that the FARCC kidnapped and murdered Consuelo Aruajo, the nation's

former culture minister. She was a beloved figure across Colombia, known for her promotion of local culture and music. So, I would like to take this opportunity to again call upon the FARC to suspend kidnappings, killings and extortion of the civilian population and the indigenous communities.

That said, I further believe that we should be more forceful in going after paramilitary death squads, with longstanding ties to some in the Colombian military and government.

Several weeks ago, Representative Luis Alfredo Colmenares, a member of the opposition Liberal Party was assassinated in Bogota. We do not yet know who perpetrated this despicable act, but most signs point to paramilitary death squads, AUC. These same paramilitaries are believed to be responsible for the October 2 murder of representative Octavio Sarmiento, also a member of the Liberal Party. Both men represented the province of Arauca, Northeast of the capital, on the Venezuelan frontier—a region that has become increasingly ravaged by the ever-widening war.

I was pleased that Secretary Powell made the decision to add the AUC to the State Department's terrorist list. It was a sign that the United States opposes threats—from both the left and right—in the hemisphere, and I am encouraged by this development. Yet, I do not believe it goes far enough. As Senators, we should embrace the challenge of making a bold effort to quell paramilitary violence. We must not shirk from that responsibility.

The way out of this mess is nothing particularly new or innovative. What has been lacking in Bogota and Washington is the political will to take the risks to make the old proposals work.

The Congress and the Bush administration must insist on credible and far-reaching efforts to stop the paramilitaries.

Further, we must provide serious and sustained support for the peace process, and work to deliver economic assistance programs that work instead of dramatic military offensives.

Finally, we need to embrace demand reduction as the most effective mechanism for success in the campaign against drugs.

General Tapias, the highest ranking military person in Colombia was coming to meet with me. It was the day the Hart Building was evacuated. We talked on the phone. I know the Presiding Officer spent some time in Colombia. I said to him on the basis of the good advice from a wonderful human rights priest, Francisco De Roux, General: (A) thank you for trying to do a better job of breaking the connection between the military and the paramilitary. Thank you for trying to do that. We know you have made that effort. (B) I said thank you for going after the FARC and the ELN.

The third question I asked him was when it comes to the murder of civil society people such as the people I met

on two trips to Barrancabermeja—some of whom I met, some of whom are no longer alive—people who work with Francisco De Roux, probably the best economic development organization in Colombia—they are murdered with impunity. I said to the general: Where are you? Where is the military? And where are the police in defending the civil society?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield for just one moment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, military-paramilitary linkages are long and historic. Everybody agrees. I told you that FARC and the ELN are not Robin Hood organizations. But the paramilitaries, now listed as a terrorist organization by our State Department, account for 75 percent of the killings in Colombia by the AUC.

The U.S. State Department, the United Nations High Commission on Human Rights, Amnesty international, and Human Rights Watch are among the organizations who have documented that the official Colombian military has remained linked closely with the paramilitaries and all too often collaborates in these atrocities.

We don't need to be giving out any more money.

The State Department's September 2000 report mentions "credible allegations of cooperation with paramilitary groups, including instances of both silent support and direct collaboration by members of the armed forces."

Two weeks ago, Human Rights Watch released a report titled, "Sixth Division: Military-Paramilitary Ties and U.S. Policy in Colombia." It is troubling.

The "Sixth Division" is a phrase Colombians use to refer to paramilitary groups seen to act as simply another part of the Colombian military. The Colombian military has five divisions.

In this report, Human Rights Watch focuses on three Colombian Army brigades: The Twenty-Fourth, Third, and Fifth Brigades.

I asked the general about direct ties to the paramilitary. They are documented. The paramilitaries are brazen. President Pastrana operates in good faith, and I know he has publicly deplored the paramilitary atrocities. But the armed forces have yet to take the critical steps necessary to prevent future killings by suspending these high-ranking security force members suspected of supporting these abuses.

I am telling you that it is documented. We know. But these military folks aren't removed. They are not suspended. Nothing or very little is done. I don't think we need to spend more money on this.

Human rights abusers are rewarded with promotion. The joint report of the

Washington Office on Latin America, Amnesty International, and Human Rights Watch talks about the fact that a number of different high-ranking military people involved in atrocities are directly involved with the paramilitary, and are promoted.

Human rights workers are under attack. There are systematic mass killings of union leaders and their members by the paramilitary in Colombia.

I describe that as genocide. That is what it is. As a matter of fact, the AUC has actually bragged about this. Their leader bragged about this.

And we need to give them more money? I don't think so.

I wish I could mention some of the courageous people who have been murdered.

I have gone to Colombia twice. I have gone to Barrancabermeja. I have gone there because it is sort of a safe haven in Colombia. It is one of the most violent cities in a very violent country.

I have had the opportunity to meet with a man that I consider to be really one of the greatest individuals I have ever met—Francisco De Roux, referred to as Father "Pacho." Why is he so respected and beloved? He has an organization called the Program of Development and Peace of the Magdalena Medio located in Barranca. They do wonderful social justice and economic development work.

In the last several months, a number of innocent civilians, such as Alma Rosa Jaramillo and Eduardo Estrada, brave volunteers, were brutally assassinated—one, I think, in front of his family members. It was awful. They were murdered by the AUC. They were murdered by the paramilitary, and the civil society people who work for their organization still wait for the prosecution.

I said to General Carreno, the military man in the region: Here is AUC's leader, the bad guys. Go get them.

It hasn't happened.

I thank my colleague, Senator LEAHY, because I think there are some important human rights safeguards and Leahy safeguards in this legislation that go absolutely in the right direction.

I will zero in on this for the Feingold amendment on fumigating and spraying. I am in profound opposition with the amendment of my colleague from Florida, who is one of my favorite Senators. I am not just saying that; he is. I have great respect for him. I oppose the additional ways in which money is being spent.

Funding for disaster relief—you name it—and health care makes a whole lot more sense. I don't think we need to be putting any more money into this plan. Believe me. There are important human rights questions to be raised. I don't think the Colombian Government has been nearly as accountable as they should.

Frankly, even with the war on the counternarcotics effort, there are very

real questions as to how effective this is.

At the very minimum, let's not spend even more money without making sure first we have the accountability, especially on the human rights issues.

My colleague from Florida said: What is the message going to be? I will say this: What is the message going to be if the United States of America, over and over, all of a sudden says when it comes to democracy and when it comes to the human rights question that we are going to put all of that in parenthesis, and we are going to turn our gaze away from it, that it makes no difference to us, and it is not a priority for our government?

If we do that, we will no longer be lighting the candle for the world. It would be a profound mistake.

I hope colleagues will vote against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am rather disappointed with this amendment. Senators have every right, of course, to offer any amendment they have.

This bill has been before the Senate for almost 2 weeks now. We just heard about this amendment a very short time ago today. This amendment cuts at least \$164 million from important programs, as the Senator from Minnesota and others have pointed out. I mention the money it is cutting because these are programs where funds have been requested by both Republicans and Democrats.

The amendment of the Senator from Florida would transfer those funds to the Andean Counterdrug Program. That program essentially consists of military and economic assistance to four principal countries—Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador—but these are not countries that are going unfunded. They already get over a half billion dollars in this bill—well over a half billion dollars. They get \$567 million.

I do not believe there is any region, other than possibly Middle East countries and the former Soviet Republics, that gets that amount of money. That \$567 million is on top of the \$1,300 million—\$1.3 billion—that we provided for Plan Colombia last year. In fact, it is not a half billion dollars; it is more than a half billion dollars. It is nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars when you include the economic and development aid in this bill for the Andean countries, and that is there on top of the counterdrug aid.

So you take the funds that are already in this bill—not the funds added by the Senator from Florida, but the funds already in this bill—and we will have provided over \$2 billion for these countries in the past 16 months; in 1½ years, over \$2 billion.

In fact, by pouring money down there so fast, they can't even spend it yet. Much of last year's funds have not even been disbursed. Even though they have

not spent all the money, we are giving them another \$700 million in additional funding this year.

It is no secret that—and, actually, I am not alone in this body—I am skeptical that this program will have an appreciable impact on the amount of illegal drugs coming into the United States. We have spent billions down there, and drugs are just as accessible. In fact, in our country, for many types of drugs the price has actually gone down.

I suggest, until we start doing something about reducing the insatiable demand for drugs here, in the world's wealthiest country, we are not going to do too much good about incoming drugs. As long as the money is there, we can stop them in Colombia, but they will just come from somewhere else. Secretary Rumsfeld has said much the same thing.

In fact, a lot of other members of the Appropriations Committee—in both parties—expressed similar doubts in a hearing we held earlier this year. We had a hearing where the administration came up.

We asked them: By the way, how much money has been spent that we have given you so far?

They said: Gee, we don't know. We will try to get back to you on that.

We said: Well, with a billion dollars or so, you must have some kind of basic idea what you spent the money on.

They said: We don't know, but we will sure check into it.

When my kids were little, I gave them a small allowance. I did not expect them to tell me where it all went—whether it was baseball cards or comic books or ice cream cones or something like that—but we were talking about a few dollars. When you give somebody \$1 billion, you would kind of like to know what they do with it.

So I said: If you can't tell us where you spent it, how about letting us in on a little secret. Has anything been accomplished with the money we gave you?

They said: We will have to get back to you on that. We don't know how much has been spent. We don't know how much has been accomplished. We do know we have another \$700 million in this bill, and we have a whole lot of money in the pipeline that is not yet spent.

We keep pouring money in. We do not even know if the program will work. But the administration wants some money in there. We put in a lot of money. We have a lot of other similar programs, especially in foreign policy. We pour a whole lot of money in there and not much comes out.

We have spent billions of dollars to combat drugs in the Andes over the past 15 years, and we have eradicated coca and we have eradicated opium poppy in several places, but, of course, they just pop up somewhere else. It is sort of like Whack-A-Mole—knock down one, it pops up somewhere else.

And we have found one other thing: The flow of illegal drugs into this country, no matter what we do in other countries, reflects our demand. If the demand for drugs goes up in this country, the flow of drugs coming into this country increases. If the demand for drugs drops, the flow of drugs into this country drops. Far more than what we do with our Customs agents—and they are extremely good—or the DEA or the Coast Guard or anything else, in a nation of a quarter of a billion people, if we want to spend billions upon billions upon billions of dollars for drugs, the drugs will come.

But even though there is serious doubts about whether this works, Senator MCCONNELL and I have tried to give the administration the benefit of the doubt. We include another half billion dollars in this bill, on top of the billions already there.

The senior Senator from Florida, who is in this Chamber right now, is a good friend of mine. We have worked together on many issues. But I would like to see him try to do the balancing act we have had to do in this bill to get money for a program that actually most of us on the committee do not even like, but to give money for that program, and do the other things in this bill.

We have had 81 Senators requesting funding for all sorts of programs we tried to fund. I want to be fair; 81 Senators asked for some funding, and 3 did ask for some money for the Andean Counterdrug Program. Eighty-one of the 100 Senators asked for funding for various items in this bill; 3 of the 100 Senators asked for funding for the Andean Counterdrug Program. Other than a few lobbyists, it does not seem to be the most popular program.

But we have a bill that is in balance. I know the administration supports the Andean program. They also support the Economic Support Fund. They support the Foreign Military Financing Program. They support funding for the former Soviet Republics. They support money for Central and Eastern Europe. They support money for the International Military Education and Training Program. They support money for our contributions to the World Bank and United Nations programs. There are a number of things the administration supports.

In fact, they have put together a legislative blivet. They support a lot more programs than there is money in this bill. If you put up a chart: Shown up here is what they support in programs, down here is where they put money. So we have had to take the money we have available. We have taken the programs supported by the administration, and also assuming the Congress has some say in how the money is spent on programs supported by this body and the other body.

All these accounts were cut by the House and, actually, in some cases they were cut below what the President requested. We restored them to

help out the administration. We made choices. We made choices which reflect the administration's priorities and Senators' priorities. They are not always the same requests. In fact, we were unable to fund over \$3.4 billion in requests from 81 Senators. Now this amendment would cut those even further.

In fact, the Andean Counterdrug Program received a lot more funding than many other critical programs. We provide more money for the Andean Counterdrug Program than we do to combat AIDS, which infects another 17,000 people every day. Many Senators wanted to provide more money to fight AIDS and also to help fulfill the President's commitment to do that, but we are \$1 billion short of what we should be spending on AIDS.

Incidentally, we provide more for the Andean Regional Initiative than we do for assistance to the world's 22 million refugees.

Other Senators have asked for more money for refugees, but we were unable to do it partly because of the huge amount of money we are already putting in the Andean Counterdrug Program.

Incidentally, we provide over twice as much in this bill for the Andean Counterdrug Program as for all disaster relief programs worldwide—for victims of war, earthquakes, drought, and other calamities in all of Africa, Central America, and Asia—even at a time when we are trying to point out to the rest of the world that we are not the Great Satan that Osama bin Laden and others try to make us out to be, that we do help in these areas. We don't help as much as the Andean Counterdrug Program, but we will help.

When I see requests for more money for the Andean Counterdrug Program, it worries me. We already spend four times as much for the Andean Counterdrug Program as for basic education programs worldwide, even though the President and Members of both parties have said we should do more to help improve education worldwide so that we will have educated people and the next generation coming along will be educated and have a better idea of what the United States and other democracies are like as well as what the real culture of their own country is like.

We provide four times as much for the Andean Counterdrug Program as for microcredit programs for loans for the world's absolutely poorest people, loans that help in many countries allow women, for the first time in the history of those countries, to have a basic modicum of independence. For women who have absolutely nothing otherwise, have no way of doing it, this program helps. We provide four times as much for the Andean Counterdrug Program. We provide more for the Andean Counterdrug Program than we do for antiterrorism programs or non-proliferation programs. We actually

should be spending twice as much for those programs. We can't because of all the money we are already putting into the Andean Counterdrug Program.

At some point we have to set some priorities. We have poured in money so fast they can't even spend the money they have in the pipeline. The administration, when they provide sworn testimony before the Congress, can't even tell us what the money is being spent for. Yet they want more. How many other programs do we have to cut? We provide more for this than we do for our export programs.

Let's go back and tell some of the small businesses in America that depend on the export business and that could employ people at a time when the economy is going in the tank, let's tell some of these small companies, sorry, we can't help you build up your business so you can export and hire people who have been laid off to come back because we have to give the Andean Counterdrug Program more money beyond the billions we have already spent.

Maybe we ought to be cutting these export programs. The heck with putting people back to work; we have to send some money down to the Andean Counterdrug Program. We don't know where it is going. We don't know how it is being spent. We know it is not effective. We know it hasn't stopped drugs coming up here. But let's make ourselves feel good and send it down there. Sorry, you are getting laid off from your factory job here.

I care about international health. We have a total of \$175 million in this bill to combat infectious diseases such as tuberculosis and malaria. They kill about 3 million people a year. We can help, with some of this money, to make sure some of these infectious diseases that are a postage stamp or an airplane trip away from the United States, to stop them from coming in this country. But we don't have enough money to do that. We don't have enough money not only to help these people eradicate these diseases in their own country but to stop them from coming into our country because we don't have enough money. Why? We are spending four times more on the Andean Counterdrug Program, four times what we are doing to stop diseases—smallpox, tuberculosis, malaria, or the Ebola plague—from coming into our country.

Ask somebody who has picked up the paper in the last few days what they think our priorities are.

One would think from this amendment that Senator MCCONNELL and I don't support a counterdrug program. That is not so. We are willing to give the benefit of the doubt. It hasn't proven it has done anything yet. It has yet to demonstrate any impact on the drug program in this country. But we are willing to give the administration a chance, and so we have thrown in a half a billion dollars on top of the \$1.3 billion of last year. The administration says it has not worked. It can't show

anything where it has been successful, but "give us some more and we will do it." We have done that.

If we add even more money for it, where do we cut? This amendment cuts across the board. It cuts Egypt. It cuts Israel. It cuts Jordan. It cuts money for the former Soviet Union. It cuts education. It cuts TB prevention programs. It cuts education of children. It cuts programs that might give some economic stability to poor women across the world. Why? To go into an Andean Counterdrug Program where they can't even account for the money they have.

I want to help Colombia. I want to help Bolivia. I want to help Ecuador. I want to help Peru. We have put a half a billion dollars in here to do that, even though that is money from priorities that might do the country better.

I met the head of Colombia's armed forces last week. I have met him before. I have nothing but complete respect and admiration for President Pastrana of Colombia. I consider Colombia's Ambassador, Ambassador Moreno, a friend. I think he is one of the best ambassadors any country has sent here. He knows how the administration works. He knows how our country works. He knows what our culture is. He speaks out forcefully for his own country. He does it with great respect for Colombia, but also with appropriate respect for the country in which he is serving. In fact, I sometimes wish some of the ambassadors we sent to other countries could do their job as well as Ambassador Moreno does.

I hope that this half a billion dollars—actually more than half a billion dollars—that Senator MCCONNELL and I have put into this bill will pay off in the Andean Counterdrug Program. But in the past year we have seen the civil war in Colombia intensify. We have seen the paramilitaries double in size. There have been more massacres of innocent civilians by paramilitaries this year than ever before. There is indisputable evidence that the paramilitaries are receiving support from some in the Colombian armed forces.

Funding that we provided last year to strengthen Colombia's justice system has yet to be spent. Some of it has been allocated for purposes that bear little if any resemblance to what Congress intended, in a bipartisan fashion, it to be used for.

Aerial fumigation has destroyed a lot of coca. But there are also supposed to be alternative programs from which to give farmers something else to earn a living. They have barely been used. They have not spent tens of millions of dollars we provided last year, and USAID has serious doubt about Colombia's ability to implement these programs.

If we don't give these farmers an alternative source of income, if we don't use the money we sent to do that, does anybody doubt that we will see these farmers planting coca again so they

can feed their families? I wish they wouldn't. I think it is wrong they do. But let's be realistic. If you have a hungry family there, you are not going to think of the people of another country who spend more money on their drug habit in a week than these people ever see in a year.

I share the concerns of the Senator from Florida about the use of drugs in this country, especially in my own State. I was a prosecutor for 8 years. I have some very strong views on these issues. Heroin use has been steadily increasing in Vermont. Like any Vermonter, that frightens me and worries me. But the Andean Counterdrug Program is not going to have any impact on that problem we have in Vermont. Yet there is a half billion dollars in this bill. It is not going to help most States. Let's see how last year's money gets spent. Let's see how this year's half billion dollars gets spent. Then if the administration comes here before Senator MCCONNELL's and my committee next year and starts telling us, gee, we don't know where the money is going, how it is being spent, or if it is having any effect, or they are able to tell us how it is being spent and what effect it has had, then we can talk about more money.

Before we throw a whole lot more money into the problem, let's see if the \$718 million does any good in the first place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the committee funded the President's \$731 million request for the Andean Counterdrug Initiative at \$567 million, which is a cut of \$164 million. This figure reflects an attempt by the subcommittee to balance the interest of Congress and the President over such issues as restoring the administration's 25 percent or \$119 million cut in the export-import pact funding.

Senator GRAHAM's amendment seeks to restore that \$164 million to this initiative. I think he knows this is going to be an issue for the conference, as Senator LEAHY pointed out, because the House funding level is \$675 million. While I can appreciate his arguments for funding the Andean initiative, it is clear from a hearing Senator LEAHY and I held on this issue earlier this year that there are Members who are concerned with Plan Colombia and the ability of the United States to impact narcotics growth and production in the civil war zones. Reducing funds for the Andean Counterdrug Initiative will not starve our counterdrug efforts. The disbursement of funds from last year's Plan Colombia is occurring, frankly, at a rather slow pace. Figures from USAID show that of the \$119 million provided for judicial, economic, and other reforms, only \$8 million has been actually spent to date.

So Senator LEAHY and I included an amendment in the managers' package

to ensure adequate levels of funding for counterdrug assistance for Bolivia and Ecuador.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request to which I understand the Senator from Kentucky has agreed.

I ask unanimous consent that the Graham amendment No. 1950 be laid aside, to recur at 4:40 p.m.; that there then be 20 minutes remaining for debate prior to a vote on a motion to table the amendment, with the time to be equally divided and controlled between the Senator from Vermont and the senior Senator from Florida, or their designees; that no second-degree amendment be in order to the Graham amendment prior to a vote on a motion to table; that Senator FEINGOLD now be recognized to offer two amendments, one with respect to Andean drug and one with respect to congressional COLA; that if debate has not concluded on the two Feingold amendments at 4:40 p.m., they be laid aside, to recur upon disposition of the Graham amendment in the order in which they are offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair, and I am sure he understood that convoluted agreement just as much as the proponent of it did.

By doing this—and I see the Senator from Wisconsin in the Chamber—we will be able to move forward. Again, the Senator from Kentucky and I are open to do business. I will have other things to say and will speak on the Andean drug matter, but I remind everybody that we have a huge amount of money in the bill already, and we are cutting a lot of programs that should have higher priority.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1951

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE, proposes an amendment numbered 1951.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide an additional condition for the procurement of chemicals for aerial coca fumigation under the Andean Counterdrug Initiative)

On page 143, beginning on line 9, strike “and (3)” and all that followed through the colon and insert the following: “(3) effective mechanisms are in place to evaluate claims of local citizens that their health was harmed or their licit agricultural crops were damaged by such aerial coca fumigation, and provide fair compensation for meritorious claims; and (4) within 6 months of the enactment of this provision alternative development programs have been developed, in consultation with communities and local authorities in the departments in which such aerial coca fumigation is planned, and in the areas in which such aerial coca fumigation has been conducted, such programs are being implemented within 6 months of the enactment of this provision:”

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for his help in making it possible to get going on this amendment. I rise to offer an amendment to the foreign operations appropriations bill. I am very pleased to have as an original cosponsor the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, who has certainly made it his business to follow closely our policy in Latin America, in particular in Colombia.

My amendment is intended to improve the efficacy of U.S. efforts to eradicate the supply of narcotics that threatens our families and communities and to ensure that our efforts to address this issue do not inadvertently plunge the people of Latin America into a humanitarian and economic crisis.

The amendment is very simple. It requires that the administration have alternative development plans for a given region in place before engaging in aerial fumigation in that area, and it requires that alternative development plans are being implemented in areas where fumigation has already occurred.

This is hardly a radical initiative. I recently received a letter from the administration responding to some of my inquiries and concerns about our fumigation policy. In the letter, the State Department itself noted that alternative development must work in concert with eradication and with law enforcement. Unfortunately, though, over the past year fumigation has occurred in areas where there are no alternative development programs in place at all or in areas where alternative development assistance has been exceedingly slow.

According to a recent Center for International Policy meeting with experts from southern Colombia, communities that signed pacts agreeing to eradicate coca in December and January in Puerto Asis and Santa Ana, Putumayo, have not yet received aid. AID as of mid-July states that only 2 out of 29 social pacts signed have received assistance so far. These facts tell us that our policy has to be better coordinated. More important, they tell us our policy cannot possibly be working.

Of course, some people simply disagree with this policy as a whole. I have heard from a number of my constituents who are concerned about fumigation in and of itself. They are concerned about the health effects of this policy, and they are concerned about whether or not local communities and authorities have been adequately consulted and informed about their policies.

Frankly, I share those concerns. I strongly support the language the Appropriations Committee has included conditioning additional funding for fumigation on a determination to be submitted by the Secretary of State, after consultation with the Secretary of HHS and the Surgeon General, that the chemicals involved do not pose an undue risk to human health or safety; that fumigation is being carried out according to EPA, CDC, and chemical manufacturers' guidelines; and that effective mechanisms are in place to evaluate claims of harm from citizens affected by fumigation. I believe these provisions are critically important, and I share the skepticism of many with regard to United States policy in Colombia in general.

Nevertheless, like those underlying conditions in this bill, my amendment does not seek to eliminate fumigation from our policy toolbox. It does seek to ensure that when we use that tool, we use it in a rational and effective way. If we keep on fumigating without improving the conditions of coca growers, drug crops will simply shift to other locations or spring up again as soon as the fumigation stops. It makes no sense to take away a farmer's livelihood, provide him no alternative, and expect him not to plant illicit crops again.

Without this amendment, we risk failing in our counternarcotics efforts in creating a humanitarian and economic disaster for the people of Colombia, one that will doubtless also be costly for the United States in the long run.

I also want to point out that my amendment calls for consultation with affected communities and local authorities. Supporting democratic governance and a strong civil society in Colombia are important United States policy goals. Those aims reflect our clear interest in a stable and law-governed Colombia.

This is a very modest proposal. It aims to make our policy work rationally and in a coordinated fashion. It recognizes that eradication without alternative development simply makes no sense.

It acknowledges the stake of the Colombian people in our policy. So I urge my colleagues to support it.

AMENDMENT NO. 1951, AS MODIFIED

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I send a modification to the desk. This modification changes a typographical error in the original amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 143, beginning on line 9, strike “and (3)” and all that follows through the colon and insert the following: “(3) effective mechanisms are in place to evaluate claims of local citizens that their health was harmed or their licit agricultural crops were damaged by such aerial coca fumigation, and provide fair compensation for meritorious claims; and (4) within 6 months of the enactment of this provision alternative development programs have been developed, in consultation with communities and local authorities in the departments in which such aerial coca fumigation is planned, and in the departments in which such aerial coca fumigation has been conducted, such programs are being implemented within 6 months of the enactment of this provision:”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, did the Senator from Wisconsin wish to say something further?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to make sure, before we proceed with this amendment, the Senator from Minnesota has an opportunity to address it.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Wisconsin, and others who will come with other matters, I will turn over the floor in a few minutes.

Sometimes we take these bills and we move them. We do this bill now, we will do that bill now, and it is fairly routine. Even on this bill—and I have had the privilege of being either chairman or ranking member of this subcommittee for years, handling our foreign aid bill through a number of different administrations, Republican and Democrat. It occurs to me, we have never quite had a time as we do today with this bill. We have never quite had the situation where what happens in other parts of the world might threaten us so directly.

Let me tell my colleagues why I say that. It is not a case where we have this threat of an army marching into the United States or a navy sailing against us. We are too powerful for that. It is partly because of our power and our world status that we have both the good news and the bad news.

Our economy is intricately intertwined with the global economy. Our health depends on our ability and the ability of countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America to control the spread of deadly infectious diseases. Our security is linked to the spread of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, on our ability to stop terrorism, narcotrafficking, and organized crime. These threats are prevalent from as far away as China, to our own cities.

Another less defined threat, but potentially the trigger that ignites many others, is poverty. We are surrounded by a sea of desperate people. Two billion people, a third of the world's inhabitants, live on the edge of starvation. They barely survive on whatever scraps they can scavenge. Oftentimes one sees children in food dumps scavenging for something. Many of the children die before they reach the age of 5.

In some countries, they do not even list their births until they are 4 or 5 years old. They wait to see whether the children make it.

This grinding, hopeless, desperate existence, something that is unimaginable for all of us within this Chamber, it is overlaid with despair. That despair fuels hatred, fuels fear and violence. We see it on so many continents. We see it today in Pakistan, where thousands of people are threatening to overthrow their own government if that government gives American troops access to Pakistani territory. We see it across Africa, Colombia, and Indonesia. We see it in the form of refugees and people displaced from their homes, and they number in the tens of millions.

The world is on fire in too many places to count, and in most of those flash points poverty and the injustice that perpetuates it are at the root of that instability.

Our foreign assistance programs provide economic support to poor countries, health care to the world's neediest women and children, food and shelter to refugees and victims of natural and manmade disasters, and technical expertise to promote democracy and free markets and human rights and the rule of law. That is the way it should be, when we are so blessed in this Nation with such abundance.

As important as this aid is, the amount we give is a pittance when considered in terms of our wealth and the seriousness of the threats we face. So many countries give so much more.

I can make an argument for the foreign aid bill on national security. I can make an argument for this bill because it helps create American jobs. I can make an argument for this bill because when we eliminate disease, we protect ourselves. The biggest argument I will make for this bill is how can we accept the enormous blessings of this country—we are about 5 percent of the world's population. We are consuming more than half of the world's resources. How can we say we are a moral people if we do not help others?

This goes beyond politics. This goes beyond economics. This goes beyond security. It is a matter of morality; morality to shape our whole nation in the helping of others.

If somebody came up to us today and said look at this child who is going to die of malaria; if you would give us 75 cents or a dollar you would save the child, if you knew it was real and you could save the child, of course you would give that. We do not even give that in these bills.

The approximately \$10 billion that we provide in this type of assistance, through the State Department or the U.S. Agency for International Development, the contributions to the World Bank, the U.N. Development Program, the World Food Program, all of that money comes out to well under a dollar a week from us.

The amount that each of us gives does not keep two refugees alive a

year. We do not keep up with the number of people living in poverty, which is rising steadily.

I know our economy is suffering and our people are hurting in this country. As much suffering as we have and as hurting as we are, I can show you places where billions of people would trade places with us in a heartbeat.

We will work to help people in our country, as we should, but let us not bury our heads in the sand. We do not protect our national interests in today's complex and dangerous world on a foreign assistance budget that is less in real terms than it was 15 years ago when I was a junior Senator. Our world is not simply our towns and our States and our country. It is the whole world. We live in a global economy.

The Ebola virus is like a terrorist; it is only an airplane flight away from our shores. We can try our best to control our borders, but we cannot hide behind an impenetrable wall. We have to go to the source of the problem; that is, to countries that are failing from AIDS, from ignorance, from poverty, and from injustice. We need a better understanding of the world in which we live.

Almost 60 percent of the world's people live in Asia. That number is growing. Seventy percent of the world's people are nonwhite. Seventy percent are non-Christian. About 5 percent, though, own more than half of the world's wealth. Half the world's people suffer from malnutrition. Can one imagine what a tragedy it would be if we went back to our home States and half of the people of the State were malnourished? Well, half the world's people are.

Seventy percent of the people in this world are illiterate. Instead of \$10 billion to combat poverty, support democracy, promote free markets, and the rule of law, and aid victims of disaster, we should be spending \$50 billion.

Is it a lot? With a Federal budget of \$2 trillion, that depends. We are going to spend more than that just to recover from the September 11 terrorist attacks. We are going to spend a lot more to conduct a campaign against terrorism, and we must. Maybe if we had spent more money in the first place on some of these problems we might not have faced a September 11 terrorist attack. We also have to look at other global problems. Not the problems, thank God, that killed 6,000 Americans in a day, but they have posed immense long-term problems affecting our lives.

Extreme poverty on a massive scale, population growth effects on countries, and the poisoning of our environment are problems we cannot continue to treat as afterthoughts. We cannot spend so little to combat these threats, anymore than we could justify failing to anticipate the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. We cannot solve all the problems. Nobody can.

Maybe one of the positive things that will come from the time of national

soul-searching is to think differently about what the future holds in our role in the world. The Senator from Kentucky and I have done our best to respond to these problems, but it is not enough and falls far short. We are not going to do it with a budget that is less than that of a decade ago. Because of that, we fail the American people and we fail future generations.

We say with pride we are a superpower. And I say that with pride. But let's start acting like a superpower, like the leading democracy of the world. Let's reach deep inside of the best of our country. Then let us lead the world in combating poverty and supporting the development of democracy and preserving what is left of the world's natural environment. Let's start paying our share. We have a moral responsibility.

But even if we are not reaching inside ourselves to answer that moral call, give a pragmatic reason why we should not do our share. We are, after all, the Nation with the very most at stake.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague, Senator FEINGOLD, with this amendment.

Mr. President, I rise today to address disturbing developments in our antinarcotics efforts in Colombia, and to join Senator FEINGOLD in calling for a shift in our fumigation policy.

The motivations behind the Andean Counterdrug Initiative and last year's Plan Colombia are important—stop the flow of illicit drugs into the United States. I, like every other member of this body, am extremely concerned about the effects of drug use on our citizens, particularly our children. That said, I am becoming more and more convinced that the plan advanced for combating this problem targets the wrong source. What's more, I think that the methodology used is neither fair nor effective.

I am talking about aerial coca eradication, which has been the focus of our efforts in Colombia. Last December, the Colombian military began a massive fumigation campaign in southern Colombia, with U.S. support. Under the current plan, pilots working for DynCorp, a major U.S. government military contractor, spray herbicide on hundreds of thousands of acres of Colombian farmland. To date, the provinces of Putumayo, Cauca, and Narino have been most affected, but expansion of the program is imminent. I have a number of concerns about this approach.

First, I have become increasingly convinced that fumigation is an extreme, unsustainable policy causing considerable damage. Since the fumigation campaign started last December, rivers, homes, farms, and rainforests have been fumigated with the herbicide Round-Up. Because

Round-Up is a "non-selective" herbicide, it kills legal food crops and the surrounding forest, in addition to coca plants. Furthermore, farmers and their supporters contend that glyphosate is hazardous. I'm beginning to believe they're right.

Round-Up is classified by its manufacturer, Monsanto, as "relatively safe." However, the EPA classifies Round-Up as "most poisonous," while the World Health Organization classifies it as "extremely poisonous." Directions on glyphosate products, like Round-Up, warn users not to apply the product in a way that will cause contact with people "either directly or through drift." These instructions and warnings are not being taken into consideration.

What's more, according to the Round-Up website, the herbicide is not recommended for aerial application and is not supposed to be applied near or in bodies of water. However, in Colombia, much of the coca cultivation takes place alongside rivers and ponds, and these bodies of water are routinely fumigated. A November 2000 report by the American Bird Conservancy notes that Round-Up is extremely toxic to fish and other aquatic organisms.

Putumayo, where the spraying has been principally concentrated, reports over 4,000 people with skin or gastric disorders, above and beyond normal averages. In January and February alone, over 175,000 animals were killed in that region. All had been sprayed with Round-Up and Cosmo Flux, a Colombian-made mix.

Mr. President, in light of this mounting evidence, I don't believe that we can sit idly by as U.S. taxpayer dollars go toward such a policy. The environmental consequences are serious. The health effects are concerning at best, deadly at worst.

This is an especially personal issue for me. As the only United States Senator to withstand aerial fumigation, I feel I have a unique obligation to address this matter forcefully. When I visited Colombia last year, I was sprayed with glyphosate. At the time, I had little idea of the threats that such activity entailed.

Families continue to suffer hunger as legal food crops have been destroyed and livestock have been harmed. No emergency aid has been provided, and economic development efforts have yet to be realized. In fact, according to a report by Colombian Human Rights Ombudsman Eduardo Cifuentes, eleven different alternative development projects were fumigated during the campaigns. We are undermining our own programs.

This brings me to my second point; alternative development aid has not been delivered, even though fumigation has been in place since December.

While fumigation began soon after the passage of Plan Colombia, alternative development programs have yet to get off the ground. Last July, the Center for International Policy held a

meeting with experts from southern Colombia. At that meeting, they reported that those communities who have signed pacts agreeing to eradicate coca in December and January have not yet received aid. These communities—like Puerto Asis and Santa Ana, both in Putumayo—have expressed their willingness to work on the problem. What have they gotten instead? They have gotten babies with rashes, dead animals, ruined food crops, and tainted water.

In addition, the slowness in aid delivery makes farmers lose further trust in the Colombian government and in eradication. As we all know, alternative development takes time to plan and implement. We can expect that USAID will be moving ahead in the future. But it is clear from events in southern Colombia that there was no coordination between fumigation efforts and alternative development. A massive fumigation campaign went ahead when development programs were still in the planning stage. This is the height of irresponsibility.

How are we going to get Colombian peasants to change their practices without viable alternatives?

Under the current plan, the government of Colombia will give each family up to \$2,000 in subsidies and technical assistance to grow substitute crops like rice, corn and fruit. We are providing \$16 million specifically for these purposes—a mere 1 percent of the total Colombian aid package. Many believe this is not enough, with the average coca farmer making about \$1,000 a month. Regardless, these subsidies have yet to take effect. We haven't even tried.

In the USAID "Report on Progress Toward Implementing Plan Colombia—Supported Activities" released at the end of last month, these facts become apparent. Of the more than \$40 million obligated under Plan Colombia for promoting economic and social alternatives to illicit crop production, a mere \$6 million has been spent. Of the 37,000 families who signed "social pacts" agreeing to eliminate coca in exchange for alternative development programs, only 568 families had received their first package of assistance.

Moreover, fumigation campaigns without alternative development threaten the very goals they claim to support. They fuel a mistrust in the national government, as communities are forced by the campaigns to flee their homes and move elsewhere in search of food. Individuals in these areas often turn to the guerrillas or paramilitaries in search of security, exacerbating the violent conflict and undermining the rule of law in the region. An abandonment of the fumigation policy will help to strengthen the relationship between farmers in these areas and the national government, which will help eradication efforts in the long term.

A recent study by the conservative think tank, Rand Corporation, rightly

notes that the aerial fumigation of coca crops is backfiring politically. They say: "Absent viable economic alternatives [such as crop substitution and infrastructure development], fumigation may simply displace growers to other regions and increase support for the guerrillas."

Next, I don't believe that fumigation solves the problem of coca cultivation, but simply shifts the problem from one area to another. In a New York Times interview with Juan de Jesus Cardenas, governor of the Huila province, reporter Juan Forero wrote the following: "the governor of Huila said regional leaders across the southern area of Colombia believed that defoliation would simply drive farmers to cultivate coca and poppies in other regions. 'That is what happened with defoliation of Putumayo, with the movement of displaced people into Nariño,' said the governor." Likewise, our Ambassador to Colombia, Mrs. Anne Patterson, has acknowledged that coca had appeared for the first time in the eastern departments of Arauca and Vichada.

Fumigation without adequate alternative development programs in place creates a vacuum in the local economy and food supply. This causes coca growers to flee and move deeper into the agrarian frontier, where they replant coca, often twice as much, as an insurance policy. This causes deforestation and instability among residents indigenous to the new areas of production.

This has implications not only on ecology, but also on regional security. Brazil, Ecuador, Panama, Peru, and Venezuela, have been and will increasingly be affected by massive population flows caused by aerial eradication. Frankly, I do not want to be responsible for contributing to an already devastating humanitarian catastrophe.

Putting aside these concerns, I must ask: "to date, just how effective have our efforts been at eradicating coca?" Regrettably, the answer is—not very good!

Recent estimates by U.S. analysts report that there are now at least 336,000 acres of coca in Colombia, far higher than earlier estimates. The United Nations, using different methodology, put the amount even higher for last year's major growing season—402,000 acres. Although about 123,000 acres of coca plants have been fumigated under Plan Colombia, cultivation increased by 11 percent last year. What are we accomplishing here?

There is a way out. Local governments have pledged to eradicate coca without harmful fumigation; I think they deserve a chance.

In May, six governors from southern Colombia, the region where most of Colombia's coca is grown, presented "Plan Sur," a comprehensive strategy for coca elimination, alternative development, and support for the peace process. The plan opposes fumigation as destructive and unnecessary. The governors ask that communities have

the chance to manually eradicate their crops, and call for sufficient alternative development funding.

Twice this year, I have met with these governors, as well as representatives from the Colombian House and Senate, and NGO leaders. They are an impressive, courageous group. In their visit to Washington in March, four of the governors from southern Colombia, led by Ivan Guerrero of Putumayo, denounced fumigation and called for a more humane and sustainable approach to coca eradication. Governor Jaramillo Martinez of Tolima stated: "fumigation is not working as expected. It is displacing people and continuing to deforest the jungle. We need to give these farmers the opportunity to grow other crops."

I am in full agreement. The present course is not only destructive, but also ineffective.

Meanwhile, opposition to fumigation continues to mount. Numerous mayors from southern Colombia support the governors in their call to change the policy. And, prompted by these same concerns, other prominent officials like Carlos Ossa, the nation's general comptroller, have called for a suspension of spraying. In July, Judge Gilberto Reyes ordered "the immediate suspension of the entire fumigation project"; it seems he, too, wants definitive answers on the effects of glyphosate.

However, President Pastrana's government continues to spray large swaths of territory. Frankly, the decision to proceed despite widespread opposition was a disappointment. In a country that has struggled to promote democracy and lawfulness, surely this was the wrong course of action.

Yet I refuse to give up on Colombia and its brave citizenry. I believe there are many positive steps the United States can take to reduce drug production and promote peace and democracy in Colombia and the Andes.

I join Senator FEINGOLD in opposing only those parts of this package that damage human rights and the environment—not the bulk of the assistance for alternative development, judicial support and interdiction efforts through the police.

In concluding, I believe there must be a moratorium on further fumigation until alternative development is implemented. I am pleased that my colleague, Senator LEAHY saw fit to include language that would withhold funding for aerial fumigation without first determining and reporting to Congress on the health and safety effects of the chemicals being used, and the manner of their application. Our decisions should reflect the will of the Colombian people. Colombian governors, parliamentarians, mayors, judges, and activists have all called for an end to spraying. Too much is riding on our decisions, made so far away.

I further believe we should play a more effective role by helping create genuine economic alternatives for the

peasant farmers and others involved in the Andean drug trade. As the failure of our current policy shows, the most that can be expected from the strategy of eradication and interdiction is moving the areas of production from one country to another and thereby spreading the problems associated with the drug market.

Finally, we should better combat drug abuse here at home through funding drug treatment and education programs. As long as there is constant demand for cocaine and heroin in our country, peasants in the Andes with no viable alternatives will continue to grow coca and poppies simply to survive.

I will summarize this way. When I look at this Andean Counterdrug Initiative and last year's Plan Colombia, I think the intention is right on the mark and in good faith: protecting our children and our citizens, from drugs. The methodology is absolutely flawed. We would actually be doing a much better job if we focused on the demand for the drugs in our own country.

I remember when I met with the Defense Minister in Colombia, Mr. Ramirez, he said: We export 300 metric tons of cocaine to the United States. As long as we have this demand, we will continue to do it. Someone will do it.

There will come a point when we will look at addiction and make sure we cover this and we will get help to people so they get into treatment programs. We will do what we need to do by way of prevention. That will be far more the answer than this effort.

I will focus on the fumigation. I have become increasingly convinced—and I think Senator FEINGOLD talked about this—that it is an extreme, unsustainable policy which I think causes damage to people. The experts will say that the spraying is classified by Monsanto as "relatively safe". But the EPA calls it "most poisonous", and the World Health Organization classifies it as "extremely poisonous". Talk to the people living there and listen to them. They are the ones saying they have the rashes, headaches, nausea, and are getting sick.

With all due respect, I cannot blame them for being a little skeptical about what all these experts tell them. There is some good language in this foreign operations bill that Senator LEAHY worked on saying we have to do a careful study of the health effects of this, which I believe is right on the mark. Talk to the Governors of different regions. They are worried about what this is doing to them. It is easy for us to say it is not a problem. It is easy for Monsanto to say that.

I was kidding around with Senator FEINGOLD, and said: I feel like I have some expertise in that I think I am the only U.S. Senator to withstand aerial fumigation. I was sprayed when I was in Colombia—I don't think on purpose. I don't live there. It was just one time, not over and over and over again.

The second point that this amendment speaks to—and I pressed the Am-

bassador, who I think is very good; we have a very good Ambassador. I said to her, "the social development money was supposed to go with this". Unfortunately, what we are doing, we are also eradicating legal crops. That is part of the problem.

The other part of the problem is we are telling campesinos we are going to do the spraying and eradicate the crops without alternatives for them to put food on the table for themselves and their families. The whole idea was, with the spraying we're going to give campesinos the social development money and the viable alternatives for their families. This amendment speaks to that and makes it clear we have to see that social development money on the ground; that is to say, where people live.

I join Senator FEINGOLD in this focus on what I call environmental justice. We both have tried, to the best of our ability, to raise the human rights concerns. I did that in an earlier statement today. I will not go over it again.

The Leahy language would withhold funding for aerial fumigation without first determining and reporting to Congress on the health and safety effects of the chemicals being used and the manner of their application. It is important that language be implemented. I say that on the floor of the Senate.

Many Colombian governors, parliamentarians, mayors, judges, and activists have called for an end to the spraying. Between the focus of this amendment, with the Leahy language, the emphasis we have on this amendment on the alternative economic developments—and again I say one more time, since I have already spoken to the best of my ability on human rights—it will make a lot more difference when we deal with the demand for it here in our own country. That is what will make a difference.

My hope is this amendment will be accepted. I thank the Senator for his effort. I don't want to hold up the progress of the bill. I thank Senator LEAHY for his statement about this foreign operations appropriations bill. I think it was a very important statement. In particular, I say to my colleagues, I think probably people in the United States of America will no longer be isolationist again. People are painfully aware of the interconnections of the world in which we live. Many of these countries are our neighbors whether we want them to be so or not. I think there is much more of a focus on the world. We understand now that we ignore the world at our own peril.

This is a good piece of legislation overall. I presented my critique of Plan Colombia, and I would like to see some things change. I think we have done our very best through some amendments and speaking out.

As long as we are talking about this world in which we live, I want to mention, and I will do this in 3 minutes, on September 11—everybody has talked

about it—but I have my own framework for thinking about this and I just want to mention it.

In 1940 and 1941, the Germans engaged in an unprecedented bombing of civilians in Great Britain to weaken civilian opposition to Nazism, and 20,000 citizens were killed, murdered. On September 11, almost 6,000 Americans, innocent civilians, were murdered. Therefore, I think there is absolute moral justification for taking the kind of action we believe we must take so terrorists don't have free rein, to try to prevent this from happening again. That is why I reject the arguments about what were the underlying causes of the hatred or violence.

I said to friends, some who make that argument, you never ask me to give a speech about what caused those men to murder Matthew Shepard, a gay man in Wyoming. How could they have that hatred? They murdered him. Murder is murder. Camus said murder is never legitimate.

Here is the question I have. In trying to achieve this goal, I think that force, unfortunately—and for me, the military option, the use of force, is always the last option—is one of the options that is necessary. In the end, I think the question is: Do we make this a better world, this journey we are taking?

I have spoken of humanitarian assistance. But the other point I want to make is, over and over again, we should speak on the floor, I understand that this is easier said than done, but reports of innocent people being murdered in a nursing home or hospital are concerning. I have no reason to believe that those who are carrying out the military campaign are not making every effort to keep this away from innocent civilians. I have no reason to believe that they are not making every effort. But I will tell you, we have to be concerned every single time our military action, our bombing, leads to the death of an innocent civilian in Afghanistan. These people are not our enemies. Every time it happens, even though it is inadvertent, never on purpose, it is a contradiction of the values we live by. It does us no good when it comes to the rest of the Muslim and Islamic world.

So I would like to continue to make the appeal that in carrying this out with the use of force, the highest priority must be to avoid the loss of innocent life in Afghanistan.

As President Bush said, these Afghans are among the poorest people in the world. They are not our enemies. The terrorists and those who harbor terrorists are our enemies. The Afghans are not our enemies. It is a tragedy, and I deeply regret the fact that there are innocent Afghans who lost their lives as a result of the bombing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his tremendous support of this amend-

ment and his knowledge of the subject. I am also hopeful this amendment will be accepted and make it all the way through the process. It is extremely modest. I appreciate his help.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1952

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], for himself and Mr. BAUCUS, proposes an amendment numbered 1952.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2002)

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following sections:

#### SEC. . COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2002.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, there is a great sense of unity across the Nation as we begin the process of recovering from the events of September 11. I have been very heartened by the bipartisanship demonstrated by Congress as it acts to respond to the human and economic devastation. We will need to maintain that unity as we ask for the sacrifices necessary to end this business.

Given all that has happened, all that will happen, and the sacrifices that will be asked of all Americans, Congress should not accept a \$4,900 pay raise. My amendment would stop it.

The automatic pay raise is something that I never regarded as appropriate. It is an unusual thing for someone to have the power to raise their own pay. Few people have that ability. Most of our constituents do not have that power. And that this power is so unusual is good reason for the Congress to exercise that power openly, and to exercise it subject to regular procedures that include debate, amendment, and a vote on the record.

That is why this process of pay raises without accountability must end. The 27th amendment to the Constitution states:

No law, varying the compensation for the services of the senators and representatives,

shall take effect, until an election of representatives shall have intervened.

A number of my colleagues have approached me about this pay raise in the past few weeks, and many have indicated they support the pay raise. In fact, one of my colleagues said they would offer an amendment that actually increased the scheduled \$4,900 pay raise because they felt it was too low.

While I strongly disagree with that position, I certainly respect those who hold it. But whatever one's position on the pay raise, the Senate ought to be on record on the matter if it is to go into effect.

The current pay raise system allows a pay raise without any recorded vote. Even those who support a pay raise should be willing to insist that Members go on record on this issue.

This process of stealth pay raises must end, and I have introduced legislation to stop this practice. But the amendment I offer today does not go that far. All it does is to stop the \$4,900 pay raise that is scheduled to go into effect in January.

We are spending the hard-earned tax dollars of millions of Americans to recover from the horrific events of September 11 and to ensure that it does not happen again. We have spent all of the on-budget surplus, and are well into the surplus that represents Social Security trust fund balances. That is something we should do only to meet the most critical national priorities.

A \$4,900 pay raise for Congress is not a critical national priority.

This to me obviously is not the time for Congress to accept a pay raise. Let's stop this backdoor pay raise, and then let's enact legislation to end this practice once and for all.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, knowing the Senator from Wisconsin as I do, and knowing the seriousness of everything he does legislatively, I want the RECORD to reflect my personal understanding of why he is offering this amendment and reiterating how strongly he feels about it.

Being a member of the Appropriations Committee and having been a Member of this body when we had a rule XVI which didn't mean anything—you could add anything you wanted to appropriations bills; you could legislate on them—appropriations bills should be appropriations bills.

As a proud member of the Appropriations Committee, I raise a point of order against the amendment that the amendment is not germane under rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Is the Chair aware of any basis in the bill for the defense of germaneness?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is unaware of any defense.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The amendment falls.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, in light of the Chair's ruling, I want to let the body know that this issue is not going away. I understand a number of my colleagues want a pay raise. While I disagree with that sentiment, I certainly respect their right to hold it. I believe at the very least there should be a rollcall vote on this matter itself and not on any procedural approach. I will bring this issue back at every reasonable opportunity until I get a roll call on the merits.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1953

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 1953.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1953

(Purpose: To require a study and report on the feasibility of increasing the number of Peace Corps volunteers serving in countries having a majority Muslim population)

On page 232, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

INCREASED PEACE CORPS PRESENCE IN MUSLIM COUNTRIES

SEC. 581.(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, it is more important than ever to foster peaceful relationships with citizens of predominantly Muslim countries.

(2) One way to foster understanding between citizens of predominantly Muslim countries and the United States is to send United States citizens to work with citizens of Muslim countries on constructive projects in their home countries.

(3) The Peace Corps mission as stated by Congress in the Peace Corps Act is to promote world peace and friendship.

(4) Within that mission, the Peace Corps has three goals:

(A) To assist the people of interested countries in meeting the need of those countries for trained men and women.

(B) To assist in promoting a better understanding of Americans on the part of the peoples served.

(C) To assist in promoting a better understanding of other peoples on the part of Americans.

(5) The Peace Corps has had significant success in meeting these goals in the countries in which the Peace Corps operates, and has already established mechanisms to put volunteers in place and sustain them abroad.

(6) The Peace Corps currently operates in very few predominantly Muslim countries.

(7) An increased number of Peace Corps volunteers in Muslim countries would assist in promoting peace and understanding between Americans and Muslims abroad.

(b) STUDY.—The Director of the Peace Corps shall undertake a study to determine—

(1) the feasibility of increasing the number of Peace Corps volunteers in countries that have a majority Muslim population;

(2) the manner in which the Peace Corps may target the recruitment of Peace Corps volunteers from among United States citizens who have an interest in those countries or who speak Arabic;

(3) appropriate mechanisms to ensure the safety of Peace Corps volunteers in countries that have a majority Muslim population; and

(4) the estimated increase in funding that will be necessary for the Peace Corps to implement any recommendation resulting from the study of the matters described in paragraphs (1) through (3).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Peace Corps shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (b).

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

VITIATION OF VOTE—AMENDMENTS NOS. 1922 AND 1923

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action on the Wellstone amendments numbered 1922 and 1923 be vitiated. These amendments were modified and accepted as part of the managers' package.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the Reid for Dodd amendment No. 1953.

Mr. LEAHY. Time has not been divided or anything on that amendment, has it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it has not.

Mr. LEAHY. The reason I ask, Mr. President, is I do not want to cut into anybody else's time. But since I do not see anybody else seeking recognition, I will continue, as I have throughout consideration of this bill, to point out some of the issues we face in our foreign aid bill. Maybe one issue is especially good to look at as we look at the world's attention focused on Afghanistan.

I was struck by what I heard over and over again from various military analysts and others; that is, there are millions of unexploded landmines scattered throughout that mountainous country. It is not hyperbole when I say millions of unexploded landmines; there are millions. Most of them are plastic Russian mines—those are probably the most difficult to detect—but some are Chinese mines, some are British mines, some are Italian mines, and some are American mines.

The reason I mention that is, any one of those mines could kill a soldier—ours or theirs—or kill a child. A lot of them are designed to injure a combatant, blow a leg off a soldier, the idea being, if the soldier is not dead, it might tie up three or four of his comrades to take care of him or carry him back to a safe place. But, of course, a shiny little mine that might blow a leg off a soldier—it looks like a shiny toy to a child—sometimes blows off the hands, arms, or head of a child. In fact, the vast majority of those who will be injured by them will be noncombatants.

Because landmines are also weapons of terror, they are routinely used to terrorize not combatants but civilian populations. Afghanistan is only one example. There are lots of countries—dozens—that are plagued by mines.

Landmines maim and kill innocent people every day in the Balkans, in Southeast Asia, Africa, Chechnya, even in Central America. What is as tragic is that the killing goes on long after the war that brought the mines is over.

We usually see the newspaper articles or television specials where the parties come together and they sign the armistice, they sign a peace agreement at the end of the war. They say: OK, it is all over. We are now friends again, or at least we are noncombatants. They leave. The armies march off, the tanks drive away, and so forth, but the mines stay. A child not even born at the time the peace agreement is signed is killed when first learning to walk.

We have mines and unexploded munitions from the United States in Vietnam and Laos. They were dropped when I first came to the Senate a quarter of a century ago. They are still blowing people up. They are still killing and wounding people in Vietnam and Laos.

In Bosnia, most American casualties were from landmines. The same was true in Somalia.

In Afghanistan, we gave mines to the anti-Russian forces, some of whom are now the Taliban. You know the phrase: What goes around comes around. We gave the Taliban landmines. We also gave them Stinger missiles. But landmines, think of that; we gave some of the Taliban landmines. When our troops go there—as they already have, according to the press accounts, and we assume will continue to go there—one of the biggest dangers they will face is some of the landmines we left there from the 1980s.

We and the rest of the international community are going to be paying for many years to clean up this deadly legacy. The right thing to do is to clean it up. In fact, this bill contains \$40 million for demining programs and has another \$12 million to assist victims of war, including mine victims.

But I think of the \$12 million or so that gets spent every year in the Leahy War Victims Fund, and the tens of millions of dollars in demining, and I think, wouldn't it be wonderful if we

did not have to spend any of that money because the world stopped the indiscriminate use of landmines and we had a chance to clean up what was there.

A lot of nations already have stopped using them. Every member of NATO, with the exception of one, has agreed to stop using them. Ironically enough, even though we are spending a lot of money to clean up landmines, the one nation in NATO that has not agreed to stop using landmines is the United States.

Every nation in the Western Hemisphere has banned the use of landmines except two, the United States and Cuba. Interesting company. Cuba should ban them; the United States should ban them. Every other country in our Western Hemisphere has.

Two months ago, terrorism was a foreign concept to so many Americans. Anthrax was a foreign concept. But it is not any longer. We have experienced the tragedy and fear that people in many countries have lived with for years.

Fortunately, in our Nation, when it comes to landmines, we have not used landmines on American soil since the Civil War. I can't help but think if landmines were used in this country to terrorize Americans, as they are in other countries, then the United States, I am sure, would have joined the 142 other nations in banning their use.

Ask people who have served in combat. Most people who actually served in combat tell me that mines are more trouble than they are worth, and any enemy worth its salt can breach a minefield in a matter of minutes. A child cannot; the enemy can.

You scatter landmines and then your own troops—who often need to maneuver quickly because sometimes the battlefield moves very quickly—risk triggering their own mines. The battle might be over in a matter of hours, but even self-deactivating mines stay longer than that. The battle can ebb and flow very quickly.

Unfortunately, the Pentagon has been bogged down in a costly, poorly designed program to find alternatives to mines. Although it might have seemed like a good idea when it was proposed 6 years ago, it has been managed by people who have no sense of urgency and who never believed in the goal anyway. They spent the money, but there is little to show for it.

It makes me think of that PBS program, "Yes, Minister"—a wonderful program. You had a British minister who, while elected, had the head of the public service for his ministry who did not agree with anything the minister wanted to do; but he was so nice.

Every time the minister said, we have to go forward with programs like this, that, or the other thing, the head of his civil service would say: Yes, Minister. Of course, Minister. Wonderful idea, Minister. We will do it in the fullness of time. And the minister finally

realized "the fullness of time" was not his lifetime.

That is what has happened with those who have been tasked with the idea of coming up with this alternative to landmines. They do not believe in it, so they drag their feet. They know those of us in Congress who support it will someday leave; they hope the sooner the better. Administrations come and go. But the irony is, we do not need to even search for alternatives.

As many retired and active duty defense officials will say privately, we already have suitable alternative weapons technologies. We have smart weapons. We have sensor technologies that are a lot more cost-effective than mines. They are safer for our soldiers, and they don't impede their mobility. I hope that the Pentagon, with all the weapons in its arsenal, is not going to add to the millions of landmines already littering Afghanistan.

They threaten civilian and humanitarian aid workers. They terrorize and kill and maim refugees who are trying to flee. These indiscriminate weapons don't belong on today's battlefield no matter who is putting them there, no matter how right they think their cause.

The administration is conducting a review of its landmine policy. We can have a mine-free military if we want. Then probably it would not be long before Russia would do the same. Wouldn't it be nice if we could say that in the western hemisphere, where today every country except the United States and Cuba has banned mines, we banned mines as every other country except Cuba? Now it is your turn. Wouldn't it be nice when we sent our Ambassador to NATO not to have to look away when every single NATO ally tells us they have banned their landmines and we haven't?

The Clinton administration took some first steps, but they never fully grasped the issue. They didn't understand it. Some did not want to. I believe the President did want to but didn't follow through.

This administration has an opportunity to design a roadmap to finish the job. It would increase the effectiveness and mobility and the safety of our own troops. This is not something we do just to help other countries. It would actually help our own troops. It would take White House leadership, but it can be done. The White House lead would be strongly supported by the Congress, Republicans and Democrats, because so many across the political spectrum have already voted to ban landmines.

One person in this country has done more than any other to bring to the world's attention the need to ban landmines. That is Bobby Muller, the head of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation. Bobby Muller is known and admired by so many Senators, particularly those who served in combat. He is perhaps the most visionary, eloquent, dedicated, and inspiring person I have met.

He enlisted in the Marine Corps. He volunteered to serve in Vietnam. He was paralyzed from the waist down from a gunshot wound. Last weekend he was honored by Hofstra University, his alma mater, with its lifetime achievement award.

I ask unanimous consent that a Newsday article about this award be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsday, Oct. 17, 2001]

A MAN REBORN

(By Marc Siegel) (By Marc Siegel)

United States Marine Corps 1st Lt. Robert Olivier Muller will remember the day he died for the rest of his life.

On April 29, 1969, the 23-year-old infantry officer was standing at the base of a hill in northernmost South Vietnam, 10,000 feet below the demilitarized zone and some 10,000 miles from his home in Great Neck.

Lt. Muller was serving in an advisory capacity to 600 South Vietnamese soldiers. They were massing for attack against a handful of dug-in Viet Cong, 15 or so suicidal fanatics bleeding and dazed from the concussive air attacks and ferocious shelling unleashed upon them.

With soldierly instincts honed from eight months on active duty in a country ravaged by civil war, Muller sensed a big mismatch: He knew his battalion lacked the stomach to take the high ground from an entrenched enemy force bent on defending its turf to the death. Incensed that 15 Viet Cong could keep his 600-man unit at bay, Muller rallied the outfit into formation behind three U.S. Marine tanks and led them up the rise. Foot by foot, they ascended the hill without a misstep until the bullets started to fly. Instantly, the South Vietnamese scattered, turning Muller into a sitting duck.

And that's when it happened. That's when a bullet ripped through Muller's chest, puncturing both lungs and splintering the fifth thoracic vertebrae of his spine before exiting his broken back. That's when this stranger in a strange land collapsed on the dank dirt and closed his eyes in the midafternoon light.

Fast forward more than three decades to Hofstra University on Long Island, where homecoming weekend kicks off Friday with a special awards reception. The high point is the honor to be bestowed on one of Hofstra's own for extraordinary lifetime achievement—alumnus of the year.

The distinction in 2001 goes to a local boy who never made the top half of his class in law school. "I was the most average student you could have imagined," the recipient says matter-of-factly.

But consider that when Kerry Kennedy Cuomo compiled a short list of "human-rights defenders who are changing our world" for inclusion in her book, "Speak Truth to Power," this "most average student" made it beside such stalwarts as the Dalai Lama and Elie Wiesel. Or when Bruce Springsteen composed "Born in the U.S.A.," his hard-driving tribute to Vietnam veterans, this "most average student" served as a good part of his inspiration. Or when the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize was conferred on the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, this "most average student" was the co-founder of the movement.

Considering all the testimonials heaped on this "most average student," perhaps his greatest act was the act of survival. Hofstra's alumnus of the year, you see, is Robert O. Muller, whose life ended on April

29, 1969, in Vietnam, only to be reborn a short time later, crippled from the chest down and altered forever from the neck up.

By all accounts, Bobby Muller, now 56, never should have made it to the dawning of a new day, much less to home or to homecoming.

"I was conscious long enough after I got hit to feel the life ebbing out of my body," Muller recalled. "I was on my back, looking at the sky and grabbing my gut. I couldn't feel a thing. My last thought on this earth was I'm dying on this—piece of ground."

Muller lapsed into a coma. Suddenly, a medevac helicopter hovering overhead swooped down, and medical personnel scooped him up and whisked him off. In no time, he was in surgery on a state-of-the-art hospital ship, the U.S.S. Repose. The vessel just happened to be positioned farther north than it had ever been, mere miles from the stricken Marine.

"Despite the instant medevac and great care, it was written on my chart that had I arrived one minute later I would have died," said Muller. "When I came to, there were seven tubes sticking out of me, but I was ecstatic. I couldn't believe my luck—I was alive!"

Alive but paralyzed, the doctors told him about his condition. "Don't worry about it, that's OK. I'll handle it," Muller shot back without hesitation. "The fact that I was permanently disabled, the sorrow of being told that I'd be a paraplegic—a word I never heard before—was so lost in the overwhelming joy of realizing I was going to make it."

The bullet that stuck Muller cut him off from his past in a flash. One second he had the sinewy limbs of a long-distance runner; the next second he was laid out flat, unable even to wiggle his toes.

Something else got severed on Muller's tour of duty in Vietnam—his close connection to the country he loved and trusted.

He was born in Switzerland at the tail end of World War II, and his family moved to New York City while he was still in diapers. The family later settled in Great Neck. Always on the go, Muller played soccer, ran track and wrestled in high school and college.

In 1965, Muller entered Hofstra. The Vietnam War was raging, as were his red-white-and-blue sensibilities. "I felt it was my duty as a citizen of the greatest country in the world to join the service . . . I never questioned the war or studied the history of Vietnam. I only knew that my government wanted me there to repeal a massive northern communist invasion threatening the freedom-loving people of South Vietnam."

On graduation day in January, 1968, Muller enlisted in the Marines. He underwent 33 weeks of intense training in boot camp and officer's school, after which he was wound as tight as a racehorse at the starting gate. "I demanded Vietnam, and I demanded frontline infantry."

Muller got his wish in September of 1968, but he never got his bearings abroad. "The South Vietnamese civilians didn't tell us where the booby traps were or the land mines or the trails and supply caches; they harbored the VC, gave them information and plotted against us. And our military allies were nicknamed 'The Roadrunners' for high-tailing it at the first sign of danger. What the hell were we doing there?"

"I was bitter because I put my allegiance in my government," Muller said. "I did so with the best, most honest intentions, believing I was doing the right thing. I gave my country 100 percent, and they used me as a pawn in a game."

"But I don't feel sorry for myself—I'm here and a lot of my buddies aren't. The real tragedy is that I was totally naive . . . As a col-

lege graduate. I was supposed to be educated. I was an idiot. I never asked 'Why?' And that is my greatest tragedy—one which was shared by all too many Americans."

I Vietnam was Muller's baptism under fire, where the seeds of activism took root, then his rehabilitation in a Veterans Administration hospital in the Bronx was the detonator that launched him on the path of social resistance.

This was the same rodent-infested, broken-down facility featured in a shocking 1970 Life magazine spread "My closet pal and eight of my friends with spinal-cord injuries committed suicide in the Bronx VA," said Muller. "I was the quadriplegics, multiple amputees, men who could only move their heads. We were entitled to care second to none. I had to fight against that system for reasons of my own survival."

At the ripe young age of 25, Muller ventured into the den of inequity and started his own private war. He showed up in Times Square and blocked traffic on the same afternoon that President Richard Nixon vetoed a veterans' benefits act on the grounds that it was "fiscally irresponsible and inflationary."

"I said, 'Wait a minute, I was a Marine infantry officer, I called in hundreds of thousands of dollars a day to kill people. I got shot and now I come back and you suddenly tell me it's 'fiscally irresponsible and inflationary' to provide critical medical care? I don't think so.'"

As an activist he was a natural. "From the moment a TV crew stuck a microphone under his nose, Muller discovered he had a gift for articulating what was on his mind," wrote Gerald Nicosia in "Home to War," a history of the Vietnam veterans' movement.

Muller began popping up all over the place in Hofstra's School of Law, learning how the system works and how to work the system; in Miami Beach, shouting down Nixon during his 1972 acceptance speech; in the Academy Award-winning documentary "Hearts and Minds," spitting invectives at how everything went awry in Vietnam; in the vanguard of anti-war protests, riding his photographable wheelchair; in Congress, carrying the burdens of veterans on his broken back.

Once again, Muller found himself leading the charge up the hill. He arrived in Washington, D.C., in January 1978, as head of the New York-based Council of Vietnam Veterans. "I figured if somebody went to Washington and simply told the American people what was going on with Vietnam veterans . . . a compassionate society would have to respond."

That February, The Washington Post ran an op-ed piece headlined "Vietnam Veteran Advocate Arrives." It was just the beginning of a yearlong editorial campaign undertaken by the Post on behalf of Vietnam vets. "The New York Times picked it up, and when that happens, you wind up setting a lot of amplification," Muller said.

Even so, "not a single thing we were fighting for was enacted into law. That was a lesson: To argue for something simply in terms of justice, fairness, equity doesn't make it in our political process."

So Muller switched gears and went grass roots. "We traveled into the districts that the members of key congressional committees were elected from, and got into their editorial pages and did their radio talk shows and brought pressure from the people in their districts. And finally we started to get the programs we critically needed and deserved."

In the summer of 1979, Muller co-founded the Vietnam Veterans of America, a national movement designed to give veterans a voice and vehicle to air their grievances and drive their concerns. The political advocacy group

would bring about the passage of landmark legislation to treat and compensate victims of Agent Orange and post-traumatic stress disorder, and to secure the right to judicial review of VA decisions.

With a measure of progress achieved on the home front, Muller began to cast a wary eye beyond his own borders. In 1980, he established the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, a nonprofit group that was separate and autonomous from the VVA. Located smack in the lap of government in Washington, D.C.—where Muller still works and resides—the philanthropic organization set out to raise revenue and raise consciousness on matters of human rights affecting victims of war throughout the world.

Muller led the first group of American veterans back to Vietnam in 1981. The historic visit was cathartic: They reconciled with their former adversaries, introduced humanitarian assistance programs and laid the groundwork for future economic and diplomatic detente between the two countries.

Several years later, the VVAF brigade visited Cambodia on a fact-finding mission. "Cambodia changed my life even more than Vietnam did," Muller said. "What took place on the killing fields was genocide. The horror of seeing 10,000 skulls piled up in a ditch and legless kids walking on their hands in the capital city of Phnom Penh was a whole different order of suffering."

"And I learned there were more land mines in Cambodia than there were people, and it was considered proportionally the most disabled society of any country on Earth."

The VVAF launched a new campaign against the hidden scourge of Southeast Asia—lethal underground bombs meant to wreak havoc on innocent men, women and children.

"If you've got a machine gun, a rifle, an artillery piece, a tank, there's a target to fire at and a command-and-control function with directing that fire," explained Muller. "Not so with a land mine. You simply set it, you bury it, you hide it and whoever happens to step on that land mine becomes the victim, long after the other weapons have been put back in the armories."

What's more, land mines cause inhuman suffering. "Step on one, and all this crap—dirt, shrapnel, garbage, clothing—gets blown up your limb. You go through a whole series of operations when you're treated like a piece of salami and keep getting resected and cut down. Guys on the hospital ship would cry out for their mothers when the dressing was changed on their raw wounds," said Muller.

Beyond the physical pain, psychological torture is inflicted on the peasants who are denied use of the land. "This stupid \$3 weapon winds up being the major destabilizing factor in Third World countries, these agrarian-based societies that are trying to recover," Muller said. "And not just in Cambodia, but in Afghanistan, Kurdistan, Angola, Bosnia, Mozambique."

And so the VVAF established a charitable beachhead on foreign soil, setting up rehabilitation clinics in Cambodia. "By setting up the clinics to fit amputees with prosthetic limbs and orthotic braces, by supplying wheelchairs free of charge, by initiating programs to employ disabled people, we went through a process of emotionally connecting with an issue that we intellectually understood was devastating."

Muller and the VVAF co-founded the International Campaign to Ban Landmines in 1991, but they needed to recruit a potent political presence to spearhead the effort in Congress. Enter Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vermont), who controlled the money as chair of the Appropriations Committee on Foreign Operations, and "who had seen, with

his own eyes, what land mines were doing to civilians."

In 1992, Leahy procured a one-year moratorium on the trafficking of anti-personnel land mines. Before the ink was dry, he was back on the Senate floor to draft a three-year extension of the act, and his colleagues passed it unanimously. "I gotta tell you," Muller said admiringly, "the Senate doesn't vote a hundred to nothing that the moon circles the Earth."

Leahy, in turn, praised Muller for his pivotal role in the campaign. "Whenever I needed more votes, whenever I asked him to talk to someone, he never failed me," Leahy said.

Meanwhile, a huge global network of anti-land-mine organizations had begun to germinate, and influential support had started to flourish in high places, most noticeably in the Clinton White House and in the royal realm of Diana, princess of Wales.

The bow was about to be tied on a comprehensive pact when the coalition began to unravel. First the United States balked at signing, with President Bill Clinton citing the safety of American troops stationed in South Korea, where the U.S. military had planted anti-personnel mines on the North Korean border. Then the UN failed to reconvene the council on conventional weapons. By September 1996, the landmark treaty was in jeopardy of being shelved.

"But we had a five-term senator go nuts on this issue and drive it," Muller said. "And the foreign minister of Canada, Lloyd Axworthy, with great personal courage, said, 'We're going to do something totally different. We're going to set a standard, and we're going to invite anybody who wants to come and sign this treaty to do so in a year.'"

For his part, Muller rounded up a posse of retired military leaders who agreed to put their collective might behind a full-page open letter in *The New York Times*, urging President Clinton to scrap antipersonnel land mines because "it was militarily the responsible thing to do."

The signatories included Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf and more than a dozen other retired brass of the first rank.

"Fact is, anti-personnel land mines were the leading cause of our casualties in Vietnam," Muller said, "and they are the leading cause of casualties for our peacekeepers through NATO and the UN," not to mention the peril they now pose to our own foot soldiers in Afghanistan.

Off the record, officials from the Pentagon told Muller that land mines were "garbage." But if we let you reach into our arsenal and take them out, went their reasoning, then other categories of weapons would be at risk—the domino theory as applied to armaments.

On Dec. 3, 1997, Axworthy delivered, as promised, an international agreement involving 122 nations to scrap land mines. But the achievement was muted by the refusal of the U.S. government to put its John Hancock on the document.

Muller has no tolerance for hollow victories. Not when some 80 million land mines remain buried in the ground; not when the job of providing assistance in all the countries that need to be cleaned up and put back together lies ahead.

"You cannot be looking to stigmatize land mines in the public's thinking if the world's superpower, which has every alternative to meet any possible military requirement, say it's OK to continue to use them," Muller said.

"If we allow genocide, if we allow innocent people to be slaughtered on the scale that we're witnessing, it sows the seeds of destruction. And one day that degree of madness is going to walk up the block and come into your neighborhood."

It already has. Muller's view of the recent carnage in the United States—the main hit taking place just 25 miles from Hofstra—is colored by his frequent treks to "ground zeroes" in Third World nations. He has eyeballed the atrocities wrought by land mines. "A terrorist is a terrorist is a terrorist," said Muller.

With characteristic energy and purpose, Muller is mobilizing his forces at the VVAF to confront the terrorist threats to domestic safety and security in the wake of Sept. 11. The lessons he learned in the land mines campaign apply readily to this grave new world, Muller said. "Political strength has got to be connected to the righteousness of the argument; multilateral cooperation and agreements have got to be in place; philanthropic funding has got to support global efforts and concerns, and the American people have got to be alert to and engaged in the issues that affect their democratic way of life."

Actually, the VVAF had already been hard at work on "the Justice Project"—an ambitious undertaking that includes educational outreach programs and curriculum guides on terrorism for schoolchildren.

This weekend, at homecoming, Muller will look upon the youthful revelers and wonder who among them will go out and absorb some hard knocks, ask tough questions, learn how and why things happen, search for the plain truth, undergo vital changes, and—as a result—get involved in trying to correct the injustices they uncover.

The all-American boy who left the sanctuary of home and Hofstra in 1968 and emerged at the other end of the Earth in a brutal conflict got jolted to the core. "I'm a better man now than I was before I went to Vietnam," Muller said. "I'm certainly more aware of the sanctity of life."

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we do good things in this bill to help with the scourge of landmines. We do put in tens of millions of dollars to remove landmines. That is a credit to this Nation. It took a lot of effort and a lot of fighting, bipartisan efforts on the floor of the Senate to get the previous administration to do that and the current one to continue.

We do fund every year the Leahy War Victims Fund. I appreciate the honor of my Republican colleagues, who were the ones who renamed it the Leahy War Victims Fund. I appreciate the bipartisan gesture. Frankly, I wish we didn't need the fund. I suspect every Senator wishes we didn't. This is money that buys prosthetics for those who have had their arms or legs blown off by landmines.

My wife, who is a registered nurse, and I have gone to hospitals and landmine sites around the world and seen what good that does. It does help.

I see the Senator from Illinois on the floor. I don't want to take up his time, but I remember very well one day going with our distinguished leader Senator DASCHLE, Senator DORGAN, and our former colleague John Glenn to one of these war victims sites, run by the Vietnam Veterans of America and others. We saw people getting their first artificial limbs since the Vietnam War. Some were getting their first wheelchairs. It was a hot, muggy day. I was dressed in slacks and an open-neck shirt.

There was a man who was able to drag himself on pallet things on the

ground who was finally able to get his first wheelchair. They said, why don't you go over and lift him into the wheelchair. He looked like a really small man. He had no legs. He was probably about my age. He was just looking at me stoically, staring at me. I didn't know what to expect, but I went over, picked him up, carried him, and put him in the wheelchair.

The expression never changed. But as I started to go back, he grabbed my shirt, pulled me down, and kissed me. He didn't speak the language. It was his way of saying thank you.

John Glenn, who we know is a wonderful man, certainly not an emotional man, also carried somebody to a wheelchair. I remember the emotion on his face. He said to us afterward, as we were going back on the bus to Saigon: If anybody on this trip ever complains about anything again, I am throwing you out the door of the bus, after what we have just seen.

The humanitarian part is good, but the injury is bad. We should ban these landmines. We are not going to do it on this bill. The Senator from Kentucky has worked with me shoulder to shoulder in getting money to remove landmines and for the War Victims Fund. In fact, it was his amendment I was referring to earlier that I thought was an extraordinarily generous act by my Republican colleagues in its renaming. We have done a great deal of good with it.

The United States can do a lot more good by just removing the ban on landmines.

I have imposed on the time of the Senator from Illinois, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say in response to my friend and colleague and chairman from the State of Vermont, Senator PATRICK LEAHY has written an amazing record in the Senate. Time after time when I would look for those issues that touched my heart or defined it, PAT LEAHY had arrived there first a long time ago.

On the issue of landmines, a scourge across the world, PAT LEAHY was a leader in the United States in defying his own party's administration in begging for the United States to join with other civilized nations around the world in banning landmines. The Patrick Leahy War Victims Fund that is part of this legislation is an effort to say something very simple but very true to the rest of the world; that is, that we care. It is money that is given in the name of a Senator who has proven in his decades of public service that he does care.

The point I would like to address is part of our debate on this bill. I am honored to be part of this committee, to bring this bill forward. I am honored to be part of this debate which will result in a vote very shortly. I hope we will put this matter in some perspective.

My colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, who took the floor early this afternoon, spelled out in some detail the exact dollar commitment being made by the United States in foreign assistance. It is a substantial sum of money, until you put that sum in comparison to expenditures for many other items. Then you find that it is only a very small part of our national budget.

Senator FEINSTEIN made a point made by others, that if you ask the average person in California or my State of Illinois what percentage of the Federal budget is spent on foreign aid, people guess, oh, 15 percent, maybe 10 percent. It couldn't be as low as 5 percent. In fact, less than 2 percent of our total budget is spent on foreign aid.

America has learned a lot about itself since September 11. We as political figures have learned a lot about ourselves as well. I believe the President of the United States has done an extraordinary job in leading this country. I told him in a chance meeting we had flying out to Chicago just a few weeks ago that although I didn't vote for him, I was certainly singing his praises. He said he understood that.

I do mean it. I believe he has assembled an excellent team: Secretary of State Colin Powell, Vice President Cheney, Condoleezza Rice, Don Rumsfeld as head of the Department of Defense. What an extraordinary grouping of experience that we bring to one of the most important battles America has ever faced, the war against terrorism.

I say in good faith to this administration that I believe it has learned since September 11 that certain things that were assumed before are not true today.

For example, there were those who criticized Bill Clinton, the former President, for his personal involvement in the peace process in the Middle East. I think those critics realize today that our President, our leaders, have to be involved in Middle East peace. No other country is likely to lead those warring factions to the peace table with any meaningful result.

I am happy we are continuing to work with the leaders in the Middle East to calm down tensions, to try to find a road to peace in an area that has been wracked with war for almost 60 years. Nation building was criticized in the last campaign as something the United States should not get into, that we should not be worried about building up another nation. That is the U.S. role. We know better now. When we finally have our hands on Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaida terrorist organization, and the Taliban is long gone, you can bet the United States will be in the first row rebuilding the nation of Afghanistan. It will be difficult, but we know it has to be done, so that we can leave behind a stable government that can shun terrorism when they try to find refuge again.

Of course, in rebuilding that nation of Afghanistan, we will say to the Mus-

lim world that what we told you at the beginning of this conflict is true at the end of it: This is not a war against Muslims or against the Afghan people; this is a war against terrorism and those who harbor them. We will invest in Afghanistan, as we will invest in Pakistan, to stabilize their leadership and give them an indication of the caring of the United States—not just to prove our virtue but because it is important for our national interest. A stable world that doesn't fall into war or doesn't harbor terrorism is a better world for everyone who lives in America.

We have also come to realize, since September 11, that organizations such as the United Nations are absolutely critical. I have been embarrassed in the last several years how in the Senate in particular, and in Congress in general, we have really made a mockery of our commitment to the United Nations. Thank goodness those days have ended. The United Nations is important. There are times when the U.N. and the Security Council infuriate me because they say and stand for things I don't agree with at all. But that is the nature of a true debate. The United Nations is a gathering place for every country in the world, and it is a good place for that debate. It avoids war in many instances.

The need for global alliances has become clear. Whether we are talking about tracking down financial transactions, fighting terrorism, or putting together a military alliance that will root out terrorism around the world, we need allies and friends. The United States cannot, will not, should not go it alone. We have learned that since September 11. It has been heartening in our grief and sorrow to see so many nations around the world who have shared that grief with us and raised their hands and said, we want to join the United Nations in this fight against terrorism.

So we have learned a great deal about ourselves and our role in the world because of the tragedy of September 11. I think we have to pause and reflect and ask whether we are doing enough and whether there is more we should do. I don't believe this Congress has been sparing when it comes to any request from this administration to help our military or invest in our intelligence. We want to be certain they are the very best. We will not cut back or shortchange the men and women in uniform. We want them to be well equipped, well funded, well prepared so that they can fight these battles successfully and come home safely. I think we have seen that time and again, where both Democrats and Republicans have said that is our goal.

But I think we also have to concede the fact that in addition to solidarity when it comes to the war effort and intelligence gathering, we should show solidarity as well in this effort that is reflected in this bill on foreign operations because in this bill you will find

money that is being directed to countries around the world to deal with some of the hardships and problems and challenges they face.

As you go through this bill, you see it is almost a catalog of the problems facing the world. There is a section in here about the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa. I went there just last year. It is an experience I will never forget. I really salute Senator LEAHY for helping a mutual friend of ours who is running an orphanage for AIDS victims, small children, in Nairobi, Kenya. This Jesuit priest, who is a mutual friend of ours, is devoting his life to those children. In stories such as that, where a small amount of money from the United States is being spent, it is well spent not because it is for a good purpose of showing what is in the heart of America, but it is also attacking an epidemic which is the scourge of the 21st century.

If you were to grade the United States in terms of what we have achieved, I think you would have to put us No. 1 in the world when it comes to the military. There is no one who can rival what we can bring to a military undertaking, a military enterprise. I think the United States, justifiably, is proud of the men and women in uniform and all those who have supported them, which has led to that great reputation we do deserve.

I think if you would grade the United States in terms of other foreign operations around the world, we would not be at that high a level. In fact, many countries give a higher per capita contribution than the United States when it comes to foreign assistance. I want to answer them and say: But when you are in trouble and you need someone to come in a hurry with the best military in the world, we are there, and it costs a lot of money, and we put the lives of our men and women on the line.

So it is not as if we don't care. We support the world in a different way. This bill seeks to reach out beyond the military commitment and say there are other ways we can create support and stability in this world.

Just a few weeks ago, Newsweek magazine had a cover story I read carefully and shared with my family and all my friends entitled bluntly "Why They Hate Us." It tried to spell out in historic terms and political and economic terms why so many people in the Muslim world around this globe have such a low opinion of the United States. Some of it is undeserved. What has happened to many people of the Islamic faith over centuries that led up to this moment is certainly not of our creation. Yet we are viewed as "the West" and "the enemy," as "the infidels." That is a sad commentary.

We have to search for ways we can reach those around the world who will listen to the message of for what America really stands. I commend to my colleagues two ideas that are not part of this legislation but I hope will be part of our thinking in the future. They

come from two former colleagues in the Senate. One is a man who is a very close friend of mine—one of my closest—former Senator Paul Simon. When he was a Senator from Illinois, he identified an issue that I believe is critically important today and will become increasingly important around the world, particularly in the Islamic world, in the nations that are struggling to survive, and that is simply the issue of water, the availability of drinking water. We will find, I am sure, that in the future there will be wars waged over the rights to water as more and more people are born on the Earth and it taxes the resources available.

Senator Simon suggested that the United States be a world and global leader when it comes to desalinization of ocean water so people can drink it, so that we would provide fresh water, safe water to babies around the world—a message the United States could send saying, we will bring our best technology, use it in a humane fashion, and your life and your family will be benefited by it. What a positive message that would be to those who are at least skeptical of us—if not those who despise us—that we are a caring people. I hope the idea of moving forward with that initiative is one we might be able to pursue.

The second one is one that also was suggested by two former Senators, Senators George McGovern and Bob Dole. It was about a year ago that Senator McGovern, from a position in Rome, wrote a guest editorial in the Washington Post calling for an international school feeding program. I think it is one of the best single ideas I have heard. He enlisted in support Senator Bob Dole. A Republican and a Democrat came together with the belief that the largess of America's agricultural plenty could be used in schools around the world to feed hungry children.

That not only encourages children to go to school, it particularly encourages young girls to go to school. Their families see this as a nutritious meal. As we educate these children in foreign lands with the bounty God has given us, their education helps them understand better the world in which they live.

From what I read about the madaris, the Islamic schools in Pakistan where children are sent, they do not learn the basics of reading, writing, history, or science, but literally spend every hour of every day memorizing every word of the Koran, and after that is done, they leave. Meanwhile they are being indoctrinated into political belief. That to me is a terrible waste of a mind and intelligence, to limit their education to that sole purpose.

What Senator McGovern, Senator Dole, and many of us who support them believe is if we take some of our money and gather with other like-minded countries, we can provide a nutritious meal at a school so a child going to that school will know they will not only get a good day's education but

perhaps the only nutritious meal of the day.

We know what is going to happen. The more education we give young girls in Third World countries, the less likely they are to have large families, the more likely they are to have self-esteem and to have the kind of careers and opportunities and a future which we want for all children all around the world. Two simple ideas from former Senate colleagues addressing the need for water that is safe and sterile, addressing the need for food that is associated with education, so that the United States can continue to deliver the same message that we have for so many years to parts of the world we may have ignored for the last few decades.

I sincerely hope this bill receives a resounding bipartisan vote from the Senate because it is part of our strategy to make certain we not only defeat terrorism, but that we replace it with more positive values around the world and that we replace it with an image of the United States that is a true image, an image of a caring people that not only cares for its own, but cares for many less fortunate around the world.

I salute Senator LEAHY, and I also salute Senator MCCONNELL and the entire committee for their hard work in the preparation of this legislation which I hope will receive a sound bipartisan vote of support.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I spoke a few weeks ago about my belief that the United States needs to more actively and constructively involve itself in educating the citizens of the Muslim world about our culture, values, and everyday life, and that, likewise, Americans need to become better educated about Muslim countries and the religion of Islam. As I have stated before, it seems to me that the time has come to be honest with ourselves about why international terrorism has become such a growing threat. Our citizenry does not understand the Muslim world, and citizens of Muslim countries do not understand us. I believe that if both the East and the West had a true understanding of the similarities inherent in our value systems that the world would be a safer place.

We need only look into the oppressed faces of the citizens of some of the governments we have supported over the years, despite their less than acceptable treatment of their own citizenry, to see why some of the residents of these countries continue to cling to misguided perceptions of America's vision and values. The young people in many of these countries grow up hating their leaders for their oppression and, subsequently, they begin to hate our own country for keeping them in power. It is then easy for the likes of the Osama bin Ladens of this world to persuade these young people to become terrorism's footsoldiers convinced that violence is the answer to their grievances.

I hope that as we analyze what we need to do to protect our country at home, we also examine ways that the United States can play a more constructive role internationally. We need to come to grips with the Muslim faith. That doesn't mean trying to keep secular governments in place in countries where the will of the people is otherwise. It means beginning to understand the underlying premises of Islam, and conveying our respect for a population's right to practice it. In addition, we need to reach out to individuals in Muslim countries on a one-on-one basis to educate them on what America really stands for. One way to do this is to send our citizens to work with citizens of Muslim countries on constructive projects in their home countries.

This type of mutual understanding is what President Kennedy was trying to accomplish when he created the Peace Corps 40 years ago. The Peace Corps mission as stated by Congress in The Peace Corps Act, P.L. 87-293, is to promote world peace and friendship. Within that mission, the Peace Corps has three goals: to help the people of interested countries in meeting their need for trained men and women; to help promote a better understanding of Americans on the part of the peoples served; and to help promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of Americans.

The Peace Corps has had significant success in meeting these goals in the countries in which it operates, and has already established mechanisms to put volunteers in place and sustain them abroad. However, it has not been as active, in my view, as it could be in Muslim countries where the need for mutual understanding, and basic infrastructure, may be the greatest.

It is not an easy task for the Peace Corps to go everywhere, but the focus should be on those areas where the need is the greatest—places like Jordan, Pakistan, Indonesia, Syria, and others. In addition, the Peace Corps should take the time to recruit people with the language skills, ability, and knowledge of these cultures. Sending civic-minded individuals with these skills as emissaries to Muslim countries could do an awful lot to change some of the anti-American attitudes we see around the globe, in my view. The Peace Corps should start investigating ways to do this now so that in the aftermath of the military actions already occurring we will be ready to show a different face of our country, one that isn't simply militarily strong, but one that is also willing to learn and willing to help. Yes, we need to act in the coming days to address the immediate threats and challenges confronting our nation. But we have to take a long and hard look at ways, at home and abroad, to make ourselves and the world safer for our citizens and the citizens of this globe.

We need to explore ways to reach out to the international community and

rebuild after the military strikes are over. We also need to begin a process of mutual understanding between the United States and the Muslim world. In my view, the Peace Corps is best suited to this mission. For that reason, I am introducing an amendment to the foreign operations appropriations bill today that directs the Peace Corps to undertake a study to examine ways it can better serve Muslim countries while increasing recruitment efforts of qualified Arab-speaking individuals in the United States. This amendment mandates that the Peace Corps deliver a report to Congress 6 months after this legislation is signed into law, and I hope that this report will suggest legislative remedies that will help the Peace Corps undertake this important task.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it had been my intention, along with Senator FEINSTEIN, to offer to this bill an amendment relating to the Palestinian Liberation Organization's adherence to its 1993 commitments to renounce terrorism and violence. The intent of the amendment would have been similar to the provisions of S. 1409, the Middle East Peace Compliance Act of 2001, which my friend from California and I offered last month, which today has 31 cosponsors.

We are, however, refraining from action at the personal request of the Secretary of State who believes the amendment may adversely impact his ability to form an international coalition against terrorism and efforts to bring the peace process in the Middle East back on track.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary relating to this request be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, few would disagree that America's top foreign policy today is to search out and destroy terrorist networks and prevent further incidents from occurring. Secretary Powell and the entire administration obviously have all of our support in this endeavor.

Perhaps more than any other democracy, Israel knows well the horror of terrorism. The extremists who hijacked American commercial aircraft and used them as missiles against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11 are cut from the very same cloth as the suicide terrorists who slaughter innocent women, children, and men in the Israeli pizza parlors, discos, and buses. The loss of life is no less tragic, nor the fear any less real, in incidents that occur in the streets of Manhattan or Jerusalem. Like America, Israel serves as proof that nations founded in freedom and democracy do not crumble when attacked by extremists. In fact, the opposite is true. America and Israel have

become more united as individual nations and as allies against a common enemy.

The events of September 11 have been seared into America's national conscience, just as horrific attacks against civilians in Israel are felt in the hearts and minds of all of its citizens. While terrorism is a grave threat that both nations face, I ask each of my colleagues to consider the following:

The terrorists who carried out the September 11 attacks traveled thousands of miles to our shores to commit their evil deeds. In Israel, terrorists live within an easy bus ride to Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and other major urban areas. Where satellites beamed pictures of Palestinian celebrations for the mass murder of Americans into our homes and offices, Israel declared a day of mourning. Israelis need only open their front door to encounter openly offensive, aggressive, and hostile behavior; and Israel has demonstrated restraint in its response to recent attacks against its citizens.

When 20 Israeli kids were killed by a suicide bomber earlier this summer in a Tel Aviv disco, there was no massive Israeli retaliation. When Israelis were killed in a Jerusalem pizza parlor, again, there was no massive response. I think we can all now better understand the incredible restraint Israel has shown in the face of such attacks.

Criticisms over the use of excessive force by Israeli soldiers in targeting and destroying Arab terrorists on the West Bank and in Gaza are simply misguided. America is doing similar targeting of terrorist cells but on a global scale. Israel's elected leadership, as ours, has a duty and responsibility to protect its citizens against foreign and domestic threats.

Let me close with some candid comments. First, I do not believe the administration can make the determination that the PLO or the Palestinian Authority have lived up to their 1993 commitments to renounce terrorism. The proof is admitted into hospitals and morgues or buried in cemeteries every single day.

In attempting to resuscitate the peace process, America must be careful that it plays no role in recognizing or establishing a Palestinian state that is rooted in terrorism.

Second, I do not believe for one second PLO Chairman Arafat wants to end the violence. He allows terrorists to exist on the West Bank and in Gaza and spurs them into action through newspapers, textbooks, evening prayers, and even children's television programs.

Finally, America cannot win the war against terrorism without Israel. Israel has the experience, dedication, and freedom that is absolutely necessary to prevail over these fanatics. We must stand arm in arm with our ally. We must help Israel in its battle against terrorism.

Senator FEINSTEIN and I are not going to offer the amendment we planned to offer because of the extraor-

dinary situation in which we find ourselves and as a result of the direct request of the Secretary of State. Having said that, I do not believe the Palestinian Authority has been constructive, nor do I believe they have lived up to their agreements signed back in 1993.

Shifting for a moment to another ally, if you will, of the United States—if you can call the Palestinian Authority an ally these days—I want to talk for a few moments about Egypt. I had intended to offer an amendment restricting assistance to Egypt but have been requested by the Secretary of State and the administration to withhold such action, again in light of the events of September 11 and our current efforts to respond to those events.

While I continue to have serious concerns with many of Egypt's words and deeds toward the Middle East peace process and Israel, and the troubling state of democracy and rule of law in that country, I am going to honor the administration's request. It is not my intention to impede in any way ongoing efforts to identify, track down, and punish those individuals and groups responsible for the slaughter of American civilians and soldiers.

While America finds itself at a critical moment in history, so does Egypt. A major recipient of United States assistance to the tune of nearly \$2 billion, stretching back to 1979, Egypt must today unequivocally prove it is a full partner in our war against terrorism. It is not acceptable for President Mubarak and his Foreign Minister to obfuscate the assault against freedom with their not-so-hidden agenda to propagate Arab hatred against Israel and to muzzle democracy and civil society in Egypt.

An October 11 editorial in the Washington Post boldly stated what has been whispered in the Halls of Congress and in the corridors of the State Department. Here is what the editorial said:

The largest single "cause" of Islamic extremism and terrorism is not Israel, nor U.S. policy in Iraq, but the very governments that now purport to support the United States while counseling it to lean on Ariel Sharon and lay off Saddam Hussein.

Egypt is a leading example. It is an autocratic regime. It is politically exhausted and morally bankrupt. President Mubarak, who checked Islamic extremists in Egypt only by torture and massacre, has no modern program or vision of progress to offer his people as an alternative to Osama bin Laden's Muslim victimology. . . . It also explains why so many of [bin Laden's] recruits are Egyptian.

Let me be clear that during these dark and troubling times, Egypt should prove to the people of the United States and all the world's democracies, including Israel, it is indeed an ally in the fight against terrorism. The \$2 billion question is whether they will succeed or fail in this task.

Secretary Powell knows that at a more appropriate time I may revisit this important issue. In the meantime, I urge the Egyptian Government to advise its ministers and media to be more

responsible and constructive and to aggressively encourage its citizenry to understand the grave dangers of legitimizing terrorism under the guise of Islamic teachings and practices.

The Egyptian people should understand Americans were horrified and angered at news reports of celebrations of the September 11 attacks in the streets of Cairo and elsewhere. Sadly, this may be an indication the Egyptians do not share the same principles of freedom and tolerance we do. If Egypt wants to continue to have United States support, Egypt ought to earn it.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE ARAB PARADOX

Thursday, October 11, 2001

ARAB NATIONS, including those considered allies of the United States, have been struggling with their response to the U.S.-led military campaign in Afghanistan. If their contortions were not so familiar they would be hard to understand: After all, Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda organization are sworn enemies of the Egyptian and Saudi governments, which in turn depend on the United States for their security. But it took Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak three days to choke out a statement supporting "measures taken by the United States to resist terrorism"; and even then he coupled it with a parallel demand that Washington "take measures to resolve the Palestinian problem." Meanwhile, Mr. Mubarak's longtime foreign minister, Amr Moussa, now the secretary general of the Arab League, prompted first Arab states and then the 56-nation Islamic Conference to adopt a resolution yesterday opposing U.S. attacks on any Arab country as part of the anti-terrorism campaign—a position that offers cover to Iraq's Saddam Hussein.

In effect, Mr. Mubarak and Mr. Moussa are backing both the military action of the U.S. alliance and the political position of Osama bin Laden, who on Sunday claimed that unjust American policies in Israel and Iraq justified his acts of mass murder. The world, Mr. Moussa said, needs to address the "causes" of the terrorism, and he suggested that a United Nations conference might be the best forum. There's little doubt what he has in mind: After all, Mr. Moussa only a couple of months ago led the attempt to hijack the U.N. conference on racism and relive the libel that "Zionism is racism."

Behind this contradictory rhetoric lies one of the central problems for U.S. policy in the post-Sept. 11 world: The largest single "cause" of Islamic extremism and terrorism is not Israel, nor U.S. policy in Iraq, but the very governments that now purport to support the United States while counseling it to lean on Ariel Sharon and lay off Saddam Hussein. Egypt is the leading example. Its autocratic regime, established a half-century ago under the banner of Arab nationalism and socialism, is politically exhausted and morally bankrupt. Mr. Mubarak, who checked Islamic extremists in Egypt only by torture and massacre, has no modern political program or vision of progress to offer his people as an alternative to Osama bin Laden's Muslim victimology. Those Egyptians who have tried to promote such a program, such as the democratic activist Saad Eddin Ibrahim, are unjustly imprisoned. Instead, Mr. Mubarak props himself up with \$2

billion a year in U.S. aid, while allowing and even encouraging state-controlled clerics and media to promote the anti-Western, anti-modern and anti-Jewish propaganda of the Islamic extremists. The policy serves his purpose by deflecting popular frustration with the lack of political freedom or economic development in Egypt. It also explains why so many of Osama bin Laden's recruits are Egyptian.

For years U.S. and other Western governments have been understanding of Mr. Mubarak and other "moderate" Arab leaders. They have to be cautious in helping the United States, it is said, because of the pressures of public opinion—the opinion, that is, that their own policies have been decisive in creating. Though the reasoning is circular, the conclusion has been convenient in sustaining relationships that served U.S. interests, especially during the Cold War. But the Middle East is a region where the already overused notion that Sept. 11 "changed everything" may just turn out to be true. If the United States succeeds in making support or opposition to terrorism and Islamic extremism the defining test of international politics, as President Bush has repeatedly promised, then the straddle that the "moderate" Arabs have practiced for so long could soon become untenable. Much as it has valued its ties with leaders such as Mr. Mubarak, the Bush administration needs to begin preparing for the possibility that, unless they can embrace new policies that offer greater liberty and hope, they will not survive this war.

#### EXHIBIT 1

#### THE SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, DC, September 21, 2001.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,

U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: The President and I are working intensively to build an international anti-terrorism coalition to track down the perpetrators of the September 11 attacks and put an end to their terror networks. The engagement of the broadest possible coalition, including key Arab and Muslim countries, will be critical to the success of our efforts. At the same time, we cannot shrink from our long-standing role in supporting peace efforts between Israel and its neighbors, and will not stop working with the Israelis and Palestinians to end the violence there, implement the Mitchell Committee recommendations, and return to productive negotiations. I need your help on this.

The Palestinian compliance legislation you introduced with Senator Feinstein—and which may become an amendment to the Senate Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill—would be counterproductive to our coalition-building and peace process efforts and we would like to see it withdrawn.

Imposing sanctions, or even waiving sanctions following a mandatory determination that would have triggered sanctions, would undermine our ability to play a role in defusing the crisis and returning the parties to negotiations. Both sides have undertaken specific commitments to each other. We remain engaged with the Palestinians to ensure that the PLO and PA understand exactly what they have to do to meet their commitments. But requiring the President to make formal determinations of the compliance of only one of the parties would undermine our efforts to put an end to the violence and facilitate a resumption of peace efforts. At the same time, it would bolster segments of Arab public opinion that are already very critical of their regimes' relations with the U.S. and Israel, and their support for Middle East peace. In this regard I also urge you to avoid any actions or state-

ments that single out key Arab allies such as Egypt and Jordan.

The bottom line is that we agree with the need for the Palestinians to comply with their commitments and control the violence and to move toward implementation of the Mitchell Committee recommendations. But in this critical period, I urge you not to tie the President's hands and restrict our ability to engage with both parties to help achieve these goals.

Sincerely,

COLIN L. POWELL.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, is there a pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is No. 1953, Senator REID for Senator DODD.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be temporarily set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, to explain why I did not want to incorporate that amendment in a series of amendments, a Durbin, user fees; a Helms-McConnell, Cambodia; a Leahy-McConnell, excess defense articles; Dodd No. 1953, Peace Corps; Byrd, passports; Brownback-Frist, Sudan with colloquy; Feingold, fumigation; Brownback colloquy on human trafficking, I mention that.

AMENDMENT NOS. 1951, AS MODIFIED, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, AND 1958, EN BLOC

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider en bloc and agree to en bloc amendment No. 1954, Durbin, user fees; amendment No. 1955, Helms-McConnell, Cambodia; amendment No. 1956, Leahy-McConnell, excess defense articles; amendment No. 1953, Dodd, Peace Corps; amendment No. 1957, Byrd, passports; amendment No. 1958, Brownback-Frist, Sudan with colloquy; amendment No. 1951, as modified, Feingold, fumigation; and Brownback colloquy on human trafficking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendments, en bloc.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] proposes amendments numbered 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958, en bloc.

Mr. LEAHY. Including No. 1953, I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to, en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958) were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1954

On page 230, line 6, after "grams" insert the following: ", and to oppose the approval

or endorsement of such user fees or service charges in connection with any structural adjustment scheme or debt relief action, including any Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper”.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1955

(Purpose: To prohibit funding for any Cambodian genocide tribunal unless certain conditions are met)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

#### RESTRICTION ON FUNDING FOR CAMBODIAN GENOCIDE TRIBUNAL

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to provide equipment, technical support, consulting services, or any other form of assistance to any tribunal established by the Government of Cambodia pursuant to a memorandum of understanding with the United Nations, unless the President determines and certifies to Congress that the tribunal is capable of delivering justice for crimes against humanity and genocide in an impartial and credible manner.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1956

At the appropriate place, insert:

#### SEC. . EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES FOR CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES.

Notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321(e)), during each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003, funds available to the Department of Defense may be expended for crating, packing, handling, and transportation of excess defense articles transferred under the authority of section 516 of such Act to Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Former Yugoslavia Republic of Macedonia, Georgia, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Mongolia, Pakistan, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan: *Provided*, That section 105 of Public Law 104-164 is amended by striking “2000 and 2001” and inserting “2002 and 2003”.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1957

(Purpose: to prevent abuses in the visa waiver program)

At the appropriate place, insert:

#### SEC. 417. MACHINE READABLE PASSPORTS.

(a) AUDITS.—The Secretary of State shall—  
(1) perform annual audits of the implementation of section 217(c)(2)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)(2)(B));

(2) check for the implementation of precautionary measures to prevent the counterfeiting and theft of passports; and

(3) ascertain that countries designated under the visa waiver program have established a program to develop tamper-resistant passports.

(b) PERIODIC REPORTS.—Beginning one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to Congress setting forth the findings of the most recent audit conducted under subsection (a)(1).

(c) ADVANCING DEADLINE FOR SATISFACTION OF REQUIREMENT.—Section 217(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(a)(3)) is amended by striking “2007” and inserting “2003”.

(d) WAIVER.—Section 217(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “On or after” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), on or after”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) LIMITED WAIVER AUTHORITY.—During the period beginning October 1, 2003, and ending September 30, 2007 the Secretary of State may waive the requirement of subparagraph (A) with respect to nationals of a program country (as designated under subsection (c)), if the Secretary of State finds that the program country—

“(i) is making progress toward ensuring that passports meeting the requirement of subparagraph (A) are generally available to its nationals; and

“(ii) has taken appropriate measures to protect against misuse of passports the country has issued that do not meet the requirement of subparagraph (A).”.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1958

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate with respect to Sudan)

On page 232, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

#### SUDAN

SEC. 581. (a) FINDINGS REGARDING THE NEED FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The war in Sudan has cost more than 2,000,000 lives and has displaced more than 4,000,000 people.

(2) The victims of this 18-year war are not confined to one ethnic group or religion as moderate Moslems in eastern and western Sudan suffer greatly, as do Christians and animists in southern Sudan.

(3) Humanitarian assistance to the Sudanese is a cornerstone of United States foreign assistance policy and efforts to end the war in Sudan.

(4) The United States Government has been the largest single provider of humanitarian assistance to the Sudanese people, providing \$1,200,000,000 in humanitarian assistance to war victims during the past 10 years, including \$161,400,000 during fiscal year 2000 alone.

(5) Continued strengthening of United States assistance efforts and international humanitarian relief operations in Sudan are essential to bring an end to the war.

(b) FINDINGS REGARDING THE NIF GOVERNMENT.—In addition to the findings under subsection (a), the Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The people of the United States will not abandon the people of Sudan, who have suffered under the National Islamic Front (NIF) government.

(2) For more than a decade, the NIF government has provided safe haven for well-known terrorist organizations, including to Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda and the Egyptian Islamic Jihad.

(3) The NIF government has been engaged, and continues to engage, in gross human rights violations against the civilian population of Sudan, including the enslavement of women and children, the bombardment of civilian targets, and the scorched-earth destruction of villages in the oil fields of Sudan.

(c) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—In recognition of the sustained struggle for self-determination and dignity by the Sudanese people, as embodied in the IGAD Declaration of Principles, and the statement adopted by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom on October 2, 2001, it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the National Islamic Front (NIF) government of Sudan should—

(A) establish an internationally supervised trust fund that will manage and equitably disburse oil revenues;

(B) remove all bans on relief flights and provide unfettered access to all affected areas, including the Nuba Mountains;

(C) end slavery and punish those responsible for this crime against humanity;

(D) end civilian bombing and the destruction of communities in the oil fields;

(E) honor the universally recognized right of religious freedom, including freedom from coercive religious conversions;

(F) seriously engage in an internationally sanctioned peace process based on the already adopted Declaration of Principles; and

(G) commit to a viable cease-fire agreement based on a comprehensive settlement of the political problems; and

(2) the President should continue to provide generous levels of humanitarian, development, and other assistance in war-affected areas of Sudan, and to refugees in neighboring countries, with an increased emphasis on moderate Moslem populations who have been brutalized by the Sudanese government throughout the 18-year conflict.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1959

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, for almost 20 years, the Government of Sudan has prosecuted a war of incredible barbarity against its own people, leading to the deaths of over 2 million of its citizens through mass starvation, indiscriminate bombing raids, slave raids and other outrages.

I have made medical missionary trips to Sudan for the past three years and have witnessed firsthand this human tragedy. I have long supported an overhaul of our policy towards Sudan to strengthen and expand humanitarian operations in Sudan and to design a framework to assist the Administration and our allies in bringing pressure to bear on the Government of Sudan and the rebels to resume peace talks.

Recently, the Administration has taken significant next steps to address the humanitarian crisis in Sudan. On September 11, the new Special Humanitarian Coordinator for Sudan, Andrew Natsios, along with OFDA Director Roger Winter and other Administration officials, visited Sudan to explore ways to bring added relief to the beleaguered population.

The Nuba Mountains is a region with massive humanitarian needs, where access has been nearly impossible. In an unprecedented action, a special humanitarian relief flight sponsored by the U.S. and cleared by the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) and Government of Sudan delivered eight metric tons of wheat to this extremely remote area that had been cut off from international assistance. The immediate needs though are for more than 2,000 tons of food. The Administration is now negotiating expanded delivery of food aid through airdrops to the Nuba Mountains to be implemented by the World Food Program. These new initiatives will not move forward without additional funding.

In order to start and maintain such aid, \$35 million would be required beginning in FY 2002 to fund the Administration's critical new initiatives.

These new plans have great potential to move the southern Sudanese in the direction of economic self-sufficiency. For example, to spur economic development, USAID is planning an agricultural initiative to create more entrepreneurs producing honey, vegetable oils, hides and skins, and other agricultural products.

Another important part of USAID's Sudan program is education. One of the contributing factors to the instability of Southern Sudan is the loss of its educated citizenry. Over two generations of southerners have gone without education since the civil war began in 1955. Civil government is dependent upon education. The new education initiatives would help revitalize education and training in southern Sudan through teacher training, scholarships, and other important projects.

A final aspect of USAID's new initiative focuses on rebuilding shattered communities. Through churches and other community groups, the people-to-people reconciliation effort has brought peace among tribes in Southern Sudan and border communities between the North and South. USAID's new Sudan initiatives would build upon these efforts by identifying and supporting critical community level rehabilitation activities.

These are just a few of the new programs that are critical to bringing relief to Sudan, but current funding levels are not sufficient to take advantage of them. Therefore, I urge the appropriators to give our government the resources to bring real change to one of the most war-torn countries in the world by adding \$35 million for new initiatives in Sudan.

I thank the managers of the bill, Senators LEAHY and MCCONNELL, for working with my colleagues—Senators BROWNBACK, HELMS, and FEINGOLD—and me to accept our amendment to encourage an additional appropriations for humanitarian purposes in Sudan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 1951, as modified, and amendment No. 1953 are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 1951, as modified, and 1953) were agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the votes.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. LEAHY. Of course.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding that the Senator from Vermont and Senator MCCONNELL have worked through most of these amendments. At 20 minutes to 5, we have Senator GRAHAM coming to speak for 10 minutes. A Senator opposed will have 10 minutes. There will be a vote on his amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Or in relation thereto.

Mr. REID. Or in relation thereto, that is right. It is my understanding we made an announcement earlier today—both managers did—that we are moving toward final passage. I hope the two managers will be able to announce prior to 5 if that, in fact, might be the case.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to the Senator from Nevada, there is one other issue related to Armenia Azerbaijan on

which we are working. We should have a sense in the next 15 to 20 minutes whether we have been able to work that out or not. That may require one additional vote.

Mr. REID. I say to the two managers, I think the work today has been exemplary. There have been some very difficult issues. They have been discussed. Agreements have been made on a number of the amendments.

Speaking for Senator DASCHLE, there has been great movement in moving an appropriations bill. It should be an example for those who are going to follow.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Nevada, we hope he will still be able to say that an hour from now.

Mr. LEAHY. I certainly hope it is finished an hour from now.

Mr. President, I also say in response to what the Senator from Nevada said, there has been an enormous amount of cooperation from the Senator from Kentucky and other Senators from both sides of the aisle, and that is what has made it possible for us to complete this bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Kansas, we are in the process of getting the colloquy copy. The Senator from Kansas and I have come to talk about some legislation we have done together that deals with one of the horrible aspects of this global economy; namely, the trafficking of women and girls and sometimes boys and men for purposes of forcing them into prostitution and some really deplorable labor conditions.

I wonder whether the Senator from Kansas might give us a little bit of context, and then we will quickly do this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, we have a colloquy we are prepared to enter into. In the context of this, last year we passed a bill on the issue of sex trafficking. It was ground-breaking legislation for this body, ground-breaking legislation for around the world. Its effort and focus was to get at the people who are trafficking, generally, young women and children for the purposes of prostitution. It is a global phenomenon. About 700,000 are trafficked to different places from different countries around the world each year, about 50,000 into the United States.

We increased the penalties for people who are involved in trafficking. We

have an annual report coming out from the Government—the first one came out this year. It was citing the problems of trafficking taking place. The colloquy we are entering into today is to get the initial office up and running at the State Department and intends for funding in the foreign operations bill.

Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with Senator WELLSTONE on the topic of appropriations to combat international trafficking in human beings.

I know that Senator WELLSTONE and other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as well as the Senate Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, are greatly concerned about human trafficking, which impacts approximately 1 million people annually worldwide. Last year, this body unanimously passed legislation, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act which included an authorization of over \$30 million from the foreign operations budget to address three principle components of anti-trafficking: law enforcement, prevention, and victim assistance.

The bill allocates only \$10 million for law enforcement related to human trafficking, and thus is \$20 million shy of the hoped-for appropriation of \$30 million for Fiscal Year 2002 which was passed by the House. Given this shortfall, I hope that the State Department will spend more funds than those earmarked in this foreign operations appropriations bill. Furthermore, the Congress expects, as expressed through the trafficking legislation, that it will be combated worldwide through both enforcement and prevention programs; that is, sex trafficking could be combated worldwide, and that the trafficking victims would be assisted. Is it your understanding, Senator WELLSTONE, that the State Department and other relevant agencies and departments would dedicate and spend funds substantially over the \$10 million presently allocated in this appropriation?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, that is our intention. Human trafficking is a massive and multi-dimensional problem, impacting countless victims. The U.S. government is responding, but I am concerned that our response though well-intentioned, is both under-funded and under-coordinated. I believe that approximately \$15 million is currently being spent to address human trafficking in the overall State Department budget, but it is not at all clear to me that activities are being coordinated among departments and agencies or that the results are being optimized. I believe that the State Department should work this year to dedicate not less than the \$30 million authorized in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, and that this funding would be distributed to all three prongs including law enforcement, victims assistance, and trafficking prevention activities.

I am very optimistic that the newly established office to combat trafficking

at the State Department will bring some transparency and coordination to these activities. I'm sure that both of us, as well as other members, will be watching for this to happen.

To assist us all in monitoring progress, I will seek to add language to the statement of the managers to the conference report asking the State Department to report back to us next spring regarding plans and funding allocations for trafficking. Again, this is an important issue that certainly warrants more than \$10 million and I believe there are ample funds in this bill to enable the State Department to meet the authorized levels.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Senator WELLSTONE, I agree completely. I would like to make one last comment about the fiscal expectations for 2003. We understand that the trafficking budget for Fiscal Year 2002 is underfunded by at least \$20 million in relation to the authorization. However, once the office is fully up and running next year, I believe that everyone is committed to seeing a full appropriation for Fiscal Year 2003 for the activities needed to combat trafficking worldwide. This amount should be not less than \$33 million for Fiscal Year 2003, in addition to the other amounts authorized under HHS, Labor, and CJS appropriations legislation. In closing, we expect a full appropriation for Fiscal Year 2003, without which, worldwide trafficking cannot be effectively challenged.

Everybody has tried to do everything they could this year to address the trafficking and get the office up and going. It is not a full appropriation. Next year, we will push for the full appropriation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, at 5 o'clock we are going to vote on an amendment which I have offered, which would restore the 22 percent cut that is contained in the subcommittee report as it relates to the Andean Region Initiative. This is funding which would provide for the four countries of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia, with funds divided approximately 50 percent to Colombia and 50 percent to the other three; 50 percent of the funds for law enforcement and military activities, 50 percent for economic and social development programs.

This is the second chapter of the Plan Colombia which this Congress, under the leadership of President Clinton, adopted last year. It is also the continuation of the only program that we will have left to provide a means by

which to suppress the supply of cocaine into the United States from its primary sources, which are these four countries and today primarily Colombia.

I have listened to some of the arguments that have been made in opposition to this amendment. They raise questions about the accountability of this program, raise questions about the efficacy of this program, and raise positive comments about the activities that are going to be funded with the 22 percent of the fund that is going to be taken away from this account.

This is a program which has only been in effect since October 1 of last year, for less than 13 months. I believe it has accomplished significant good. It has helped professionalize the army of Colombia, which has made it more able to launch effective attacks against drug dealers. It has begun to show the ability to reduce the amount of coca being produced in Colombia. It has stabilized the governments of, particularly, Peru and Ecuador.

But beyond all of those positive benefits, I think the fundamental benefit today, on October 24, is that this is the longest running U.S. partnership program to attack terrorism in the world. In this case, the terrorists happen to also be drug dealers. We are attacking them in their uniform as drug dealers, but, in so doing, we are also attacking them in their 50-year role as terrorists, formerly ideological terrorists, now essentially thugs. They have gone from Che Guevara to being Al Capone.

I believe it would send the worst possible signal to the world that we are trying to unite in an effective program against terrorism, to be pulling the plug, essentially, on the effort that we have underway against one of the most vicious terrorist groups in the world, a group which in the year 2000, the last year for which statistics are available, committed 44 percent of the all the terrorist assaults against U.S. citizens and interests in the world.

Mr. President, 44 percent of them were committed in Colombia. That is an indication of how concentrated, how deep, and how violent the terrorist activity is there, directed against U.S. citizens, to say nothing of the assaults against Colombian citizens and persons from other nations who are in Colombia.

I hope to reserve a few moments to close, but I urge in the strongest terms the adoption of this amendment which will recommit ourselves to a strong U.S. partnership with our neighbors in Latin America, a strong program of attacking drugs at the source as we build up our capability to reduce the demand in the United States and to avoid sending the signal that all of our rhetoric about how strongly we are prepared to resist terrorism is just that—rhetoric. Because when it comes to actual performance, we failed.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, how much time remains to the Senator from Florida and how much time to the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has 3 minutes and 47 seconds and the Senator from Vermont has 8 minutes and 10 seconds.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I reserve myself 3½ minutes.

I don't want Senators to think we are not putting money in for counterdrug programs in this bill. We have included \$718 million for the Andean Region Initiative. We will have put \$2 billion in there in just the last 16 months. The administration's own witnesses couldn't tell us how much was disbursed, and for what purposes. And they cannot show what we have gotten from it. So we have an act of faith here, putting in another \$718 million.

What the \$164 million cut in other programs the Senator from Florida proposes, to add to the \$718 million already in the bill—where do we cut? This is sort an across-the-board kind of open-ended cut which allows cuts to come from military, economic, or other assistance to anywhere, including countries such as Israel, Egypt, and Jordan.

It could be cut from HIV/AIDS, from money the President and others have promised to help combat the worst health crisis in half a millennium; from money to cure TB and prevent malaria; from military assistance, including aid to NATO allies and the former Soviet republics. It could cut the Peace Corps. We increased money for the Peace Corps, but those increases may be gone if we do this cut.

Or the Eximbank, when many companies are laying people off today.

It could cut refugee and disaster relief assistance for places such as Sudan and the Caucasus.

How about programs to stop the spread of biological, nuclear, and chemical weapons? This is certainly not a time when we should be cutting those programs; or the money we have in here to strengthen surveillance and respond to outbreaks of infectious diseases, including diseases that may come here in a terrorist attack; or our money for UNICEF and peacekeeping operations.

Do we really want to cut those programs, when we have already put \$718 million in for the Andean region?

I don't want to cut the Peace Corps. I don't want to cut funding for AIDS. But we will if this passes.

Obviously, the Senate has to make up its mind about what it wants. But even without this amendment, we are going to have \$718 million on top of billions already in this program, a program that has millions of dollars which they have yet to spend.

I want to help. I set aside my own misgivings about this program by putting in the \$718 million. But I remind the 81 Senators who have sent letters requesting increases in everything from Peace Corps to AIDS that this is where this money would come from.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes, thirty-nine seconds.

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there are obviously choices made all over the place in terms of programs being cut. The point of this is that the Senator from Florida and I are proposing that we get back to the level the President suggested. This is about the Andean region. In the past we dealt with Colombia. There were concerns raised by many about that program. This deals with the Andean region. It is more than just one country. This is a critical issue. I know our attention today is focused on Central Asia, as it should be, and Afghanistan and the Taliban. But we will have to have a continuing effort in other parts of the globe on threats we face.

Clearly, we will lose thousands of people every year in this country in drug-related deaths, and about 98 percent of the product which is the source of this devastation in our country comes from the Andean region. Our attention today has shifted.

All we are suggesting is that we get back to the level the President suggested, \$164 million. It is a cut of 22 percent dealing with several countries in the region, not just one. I am sure my friend from Florida has gone over the details of this to explain where the resources go and how effective we hope it will be. I join with him.

Obviously, I am not interested in seeing the Peace Corps cut, or Eximbank, or other programs, which I know my friend from Vermont cares about very much. I understand the difficulty of wrestling with these programs. But I believe very strongly that this is an area where we have to maintain a level of consistent involvement, or we are going to find that the resources we have committed are going to be diluted significantly.

This is a very serious effort. It is not on the front pages today, but it will be again, I guarantee you. That is the reason we offered this amendment. My hope is that we can reach some agreement so we can do more.

Again, I believe very strongly that this is one of the most critical issues—not just for ourselves. It is in the direct interest of people who are dying every day in our streets as a result of what happened in these countries. Our efforts are to work with friends in the area—particularly in Colombia—people who have paid an awful price over the years, a devastating price. They have attempted to shed this country down there of any vestige of its own long historic democratic institutions.

We are under siege in a lot of places around the globe. This is a major one. Therefore, the cut that has come here is one we would like to see restored. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I understand we are going to vote at 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold?

Does the Senator understand that takes my time?

Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. I would not cut off the time of the Senator from Florida. That is really not showing very much comity.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, it was certainly not my intention to do that. In fact, I wanted to use the 39 seconds that were left to me. I wanted to use them. And there might be a few more people in the Chamber than is the case now. I suggest the absence of a quorum without that counting against the time of either the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Florida.

Mr. LEAHY. That would take unanimous consent, and I will not give it. We told people we are going to vote at 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Who yields time?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand the concerns of the Senator from Florida, who has spent an enormous amount of time in this area, and the Senator from Connecticut. I am sorry the Senator from Connecticut would not stay to hear these comments. But we have included \$718 million for the Andean Regional Initiative. That is for Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador—\$2 billion in just over a year. We have not ignored this part of the world.

As the Senator from Connecticut says, it may not be on the front page. The Ebola plague is not on the front page. But we have inadequate amounts of money in here to help protect us against such a health disaster.

Can you imagine? Nobody would be wanting to cut money for that if the Ebola plague were in the headlines. But this amendment would result in a cut of some of that money.

We have money in here to help put Americans back to work at a time when tens of thousands are being laid off daily. It may not be the big headline. But this amendment would in effect cut efforts to put these people back to work.

What the Peace Corps has accomplished over the years is not in the headlines. But this money would cut some of the increase in funds we put in for the Peace Corps.

There are a lot of things that are not in the headlines. Helping to stop the spread of AIDS may not be in the daily headlines. But this would cut money for that.

This is not about whether you are for or against the Andean Initiative. We

put nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars in here following well over \$1 billion in just the past year. It is not without funding.

His amendment allow cuts to be made in everything from the Middle East, refugee aid, basic education, biological, nuclear, and chemical weapons non-proliferation programs, anti-terrorism programs, and money to clear landmines. We need to strike a balance, which is what this bill does.

What is the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, how much time remains for my colleague from Florida?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven seconds.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, Senator MCCONNELL and I have gone through this bill and we have tried to set priorities. We have put considerable amounts of money in this bill for counterdrug programs. The House has even more. In conference, as a practical matter, the money for the Andean Initiative is likely to go up some amount.

But let us not cut money for bioterrorism, money to stop plagues from reaching the United States, money to aid refugees from Afghanistan or Africa, money to support the countries which the President has promised to help with our campaign against Osama bin Laden—let's not cut those funds—and the Peace Corps and the Exim Bank and everything else, to add even more funds for counterdrug programs when they have not spent what they already have.

Madam President, I yield back whatever time I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has 11 seconds.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, in my 11 seconds, I want to direct them to our friends on the other side of the aisle. Our amendment would restore the recommendation which has been made by President Bush of his best assessment of what is necessary in order to accomplish the purposes. The President challenged us today to answer the question: Is America prepared to stay in the war against terrorism? His answer was: Absolutely.

If we want to say, absolutely, we need to vote yes for the amendment that will restore the funds to the longest running antiterrorism campaign in which the United States is currently engaged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I make a point of order that the Graham amendment No. 1950 violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The bill before us is at the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation. Therefore, any net increase in budget authority or outlays would trigger a 60-vote point of order.

The Graham amendment does not identify a specific offset for its \$164 million increase in discretionary budget authority for the Andean Counterdrug Program, nor does it establish a mechanism to ensure that the funds are, in fact, offset. Therefore, if the Graham amendment passed, it would cause the Foreign Operations Subcommittee to exceed its spending allocation.

Additionally, even if the administration were to identify offsets for the entire \$164 million in budget authority, the Congressional Budget Office is not confident that cuts would occur to programs with an equal or faster outlay rate. A net increase in outlays from the Graham amendment would also trigger a violation of the subcommittee's allocation and a 60-vote point of order.

Therefore, I make a point of order that the Graham amendment No. 1950 violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the request by Senator KYL be modified to also include Senators GRASSLEY and MCCAIN as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I move to waive the Budget Act and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act in relation to the Graham amendment No. 1950. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 27, nays 72, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 311 Leg.]

#### YEAS—27

Bayh	Dodd	Lugar
Biden	Graham	McCain
Breaux	Grassley	Miller
Carnahan	Hagel	Nelson (FL)
Chafee	Hatch	Rockefeller
Clinton	Helms	Schumer
Corzine	Hutchinson (AR)	Sessions
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Lieberman	Torricelli

#### NAYS—72

Akaka	Bond	Campbell
Allard	Boxer	Cantwell
Allen	Brownback	Carper
Baucus	Bunning	Cleland
Bennett	Burns	Cochran
Bingaman	Byrd	Collins

Conrad	Inhofe	Reed (RI)
Crapo	Inouye	Reid (NV)
Daschle	Jeffords	Roberts
Dayton	Johnson	Santorum
Domenici	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kerry	Shelby
Durbin	Kohl	Smith (NH)
Edwards	Landrieu	Smith (OR)
Ensign	Leahy	Snowe
Enzi	Levin	Specter
Feingold	Lincoln	Stabenow
Feinstein	Lott	Stevens
Fitzgerald	McConnell	Thomas
Gramm	Mikulski	Thurmond
Gregg	Murkowski	Voinovich
Harkin	Murray	Warner
Hollings	Nelson (NE)	Wellstone
Hutchison (TX)	Nickles	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—1

Frist

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 27, the nays are 72. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, Senator REID and Senator NICKLES have been asking our intent. Senator MCCONNELL and I have been here for a couple days and would like to wrap up.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for an announcement while everybody is here?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, Senator DASCHLE has asked me to announce we have a section-by-section analysis of the antiterrorism bill. Copies of the bill and a short summary are available in Senator DASCHLE's office, the Democratic Cloakroom, and Senator LEAHY's Russell office. They will be there by 5:45 p.m. The same is available in the Republican Cloakroom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1959

Mr. DODD. Madam President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mrs. Kay Bailey Hutchison, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON, proposes an amendment numbered 1959.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: Amendment to modify the annual drug certification procedures for FY 2002 with respect to countries in the Western Hemisphere)

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following new section:

SEC. . During fiscal year 2002 funds in this Act that would otherwise be withheld from

obligation or expenditure under Section 490 with respect to countries in the Western Hemisphere may be obligated or expended provided that—

(a) Not later than November 30 of 2001 the President has submitted to the appropriate congressional committees a report identifying each country in the Western Hemisphere determined by the President to be a major drug-transit country or major illicit drug producing country.

(b) In each report under subsection (a), the President shall also—

(1) designate each country, if any, identified in such report that has failed demonstrably, during the previous 12 months, to make substantial efforts—

(A) to adhere to its obligations under international counter narcotics agreements; and

(B) to take the counter narcotics measures set forth in section 489(a)(1); and

(2) include a justification for each country so designated.

(c) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGNATED COUNTRIES.—In the case of a country identified in a report for a fiscal year 2002 under subsection (a) that is also designated under subsection (b) in the report, United States assistance may be provided under this Act to such country in fiscal year 2002 only if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) provision of such assistance to the country in such fiscal year is vital to the national interests of the United States; or

(2) commencing at any time after November 30, 2001, the country has made substantial efforts—

(A) to adhere to its obligations under international counternarcotics agreements; and

(B) to take the counternarcotics measures set forth in section 489(a)(1).

(d) INTERNATIONAL COUNTERNARCOTICS AGREEMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term "international counternarcotics agreement" means—

(1) the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances; or

(2) any bilateral or multilateral agreement in force between the United States and another country or countries that addresses issues relating to the control of illicit drugs, such as—

(A) the production, distribution, and interdiction of illicit drugs,

(B) demand reduction,

(C) the activities of criminal organizations,

(D) international legal cooperation among courts, prosecutors, and law enforcement agencies (including the exchange of information and evidence),

(E) the extradition of nationals and individuals involved in drug-related criminal activity,

(F) the temporary transfer for prosecution of nationals and individuals involved in drug-related criminal activity,

(G) border security,

(H) money laundering,

(I) illicit firearms trafficking,

(J) corruption,

(K) control of precursor chemicals,

(L) asset forfeiture, and

(M) related training and technical assistance;

and includes, where appropriate, timetables and objective and measurable standards to assess the progress made by participating countries with respect to such issues; and

(e) Section 490 (b)–(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j) shall not apply during FY 2002 with respect to any

country in the Western Hemisphere identified in subsection (a) of this section.

(f) **STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section supersedes or modifies the requirement in section 489(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (with respect to the International Control Strategy Report) for the transmittal of a report not later than March 1 of 2002 under that section.

(g) **SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ENHANCED INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL.**—

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) many governments are extremely concerned by the national security threat posed by illicit drug production, distribution, and consumption, and crimes related thereto, particularly those in the Western Hemisphere;

(2) an enhanced multilateral strategy should be developed among drug producing, transit, and consuming nations designed to improve cooperation with respect to the investigation and prosecution of drug related crimes, and to make available information on effective drug education and drug treatment;

(3) the United States should at the earliest feasible date convene a conference of representatives of major illicit drug producing countries, major drug transit countries, and major money laundering countries to present and review country by country drug reduction and prevention strategies relevant to the specific circumstances of each country, and agree to a program and timetable for implementation of such strategies; and

(4) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President should transmit to Congress any legislation necessary to implement a proposed multilateral strategy to achieve the goals referred to in paragraph (2), including any amendments to existing law that may be required to implement that strategy.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, on behalf of Senator HUTCHISON and myself—and I ask my colleague from Texas to make the comments she wants to make—this amendment for 1 year would impose a moratorium on the drug certification process only for the Western Hemisphere. Interested colleagues—Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator HELMS—have all indicated they support this amendment. Those are the Members who have the most interest particularly with regard to the larger proposal.

We believe this is a very important message to be sending. We know our colleagues have a deep interest in it. The administration supports this amendment, and we urge its adoption.

As my colleagues know, the issue of how to construct and implement an effective international counternarcotics policy has been the subject of much debate in Congress over the years. Earlier this year, I introduced legislation with the goal of seeing if there is some way to end what has become a stale debate that has not brought us any closer to mounting a credible effort to eliminate or contain the international drug mafia.

Thanks to the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee we were able to develop an effective alternative to the current certification process, and that bill was reported out of the committee unanimously.

We all know that, by and large, the drug cooperation issue has been fo-

cused on our relations with Mexico. We know as well that it is a new day in United States-Mexico relations. President Fox has been enormously supportive of the U.S. across the board. He wants very much to work cooperatively with the United States in fighting drugs and believes that the certification process could get in the way of that effort. It is important that we make a change in that process as quickly as possible.

It is not likely that we will get to the free-standing bill this year and therefore I have decided to offer the substance of this bill today with slight changes to conform to the appropriateness requirements.

First the current certification process will be altered for only fiscal year 2002, consistent with the scope of this bill. Second, it will be limited to countries in the Western Hemisphere. Other than those modest changes the thrust of the amendment is virtually identical to the committee bill.

We can all agree that drugs are a problem—a big problem. We also can agree that the international drug trade poses a direct threat to the United States and to international efforts to promote democracy, economic stability, human rights, and the rule of law throughout the world, and most specifically, in our hemisphere.

While the international effects of the drug trade are important, what concerns me the most personally is the effect of the drug trade here at home.

Last year, Americans spent more than \$60 billion to purchase illegal drugs. Nearly 15 million Americans over the age of 12 use illegal drugs, including 1.5 million cocaine users, 208,000 heroin addicts, and more than 11 million smokers of marijuana. And, the menace of drug abuse is not confined to just the inner cities and the poor. Illegal drug use occurs among members of every ethnic and socioeconomic group in the United States.

The human and economic costs of illegal drug consumption by Americans are enormous. More than 16,000 people die annually as a result of drug induced deaths. Drug related illness, death, and crime cost the United States over \$100 billion annually, including costs for lost productivity, premature death, and incarceration.

The drug trade is extremely lucrative, generating estimated revenues of \$400 billion annually. The United States has spent more than \$30 billion in foreign interdiction and source country counternarcotics measures since 1981, and despite impressive seizures at the border, on the high seas, and in other countries, foreign drugs are cheaper and more plentiful in the United States today than two decades ago.

I believe, and I hope that the Senate agrees, that for a variety of reasons the time is right to give the incoming Bush administration some flexibility with respect to the annual certification process, so that it can determine

whether this is the best mechanism for producing the kind of international cooperation and partnership that is needed to contain this transnational menace.

I believe that government leaders, particularly in this hemisphere, have come to recognize that illegal drug production and consumption are increasingly threats to political stability within their national borders. Clearly President Pastrana of Colombia has acknowledged that fact and has sought to work very closely with the United States in implementing Plan Colombia. Similarly, President Vicente Fox of Mexico has made international counternarcotics cooperation a high priority since assuming office last December. These leaders also feel strongly, however, that unilateral efforts by the United States to grade their governments' performance in this area is a major irritant in the bilateral relationship and counterproductive to their efforts to instill a cooperative spirit in their own bureaucracies.

The legislation I introduced recognizes that illicit drug production, distribution and consumption are national security threats to many governments around the globe, and especially many of those in our own hemisphere, including Mexico, Colombia, and other countries in the Andean region. It urges the administration to develop an enhanced multilateral strategy for addressing these threats from both the supply and demand side of the equation. It also recommends that the President submit any legislative changes to existing law which he deems necessary in order to implement this international program within 1 year from the enactment of this legislation.

In order to create the kind of international cooperation and mutual respect that must be present if the Bush administration's effort is to produce results, the bill would also suspend the annual drug certification procedure for a period of 3 years, while efforts are ongoing to develop and implement this enhanced multilateral strategy. I believe it is fair to say that while the certification procedure may have had merit when it was enacted into law in 1986, it has now become a hurdle to furthering bilateral and multilateral cooperation with other governments, particularly those in our own hemisphere such as Mexico and Colombia—governments whose cooperation is critical if we are to succeed in stemming the flow of drugs across the borders.

Let me make clear, however, that while we would not be "grading" other governments on whether they have "cooperated fully" during the 3-year "suspension" period, the detailed reporting requirements currently required by law concerning what each government has done to cooperate in the areas of eradication, extradition, asset seizure, money laundering and demand reduction during the previous calendar year will remain in force. We will be fully informed as to whether

governments are falling short of their national and international obligations. The annual determination as to which countries are major producers or transit sources of illegal drugs will also continue to be required by law. The President is also mandated to withhold U.S. assistance from any country that has been deemed to have failed to meet its international obligations with respect to counter narcotics matters, although he may waive that mandate if he deems it will serve U.S. interests.

I believe that we need to reach out to other governments who share our concerns about the threat that drugs pose to the fabric of their societies and our own. It is arrogant to assume we are the only nation that cares about such matters. We need to sit down and figure out what each of us can do better to make it harder for drug traffickers to ply their trade. Together, working collectively, we can defeat the traffickers. But if we expend our energies playing the blame game, we are certainly not going to effectively address their threat. We are not going to stop one additional teenager from becoming hooked on drugs, or one more citizen from being mugged outside his home by some drug crazed thief.

During the Clinton administration, Barry McCaffrey, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy did a fine job in attempting to forge more cooperative relations with Colombia, Mexico, and other countries in our own hemisphere. The OAS has also done some important work over the last several years in putting in place an institutional framework for dealing with the complexities of compiling national statistics so that we can better understand what needs to be done. The United Nations, through its Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention has also made some important contributions in furthering international cooperation in this area. However, still more needs to be done. I believe my legislation will build upon that progress.

It is my hope that a change in the certification process coupled with new administrations in the United States and Mexico provide a window of opportunity for the United States working with Mexico to spearhead international efforts to find better and more effective ways for multilateral cooperation. That is why I hope my colleagues will support this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, this is something we must do. We have been working with Mexico on the drug issue for a long time, and we want to put forward a comprehensive program that will be a sharing of responsibility. We will do that, but at this time we do not want the deadline to come on us and not be able to certify Mexico.

We are working with Colombia. They are trying very hard to rid themselves of their drug problem. We want to help them, not hurt them.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut for taking the lead on this issue. I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1959.

The amendment (No. 1959) was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I believe we are almost done. Just so people will know, I am about to propound a unanimous consent request regarding a Hutchison amendment on tuberculosis, a Bingaman amendment on Central America drought relief, a Leahy AIDS and malaria funding amendment, a Stabenow amendment on the victims of terrorism, a Landrieu amendment on child soldiers, and a McConnell technical amendment.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1960 THROUGH 1965, EN BLOC

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to bring forward an amendment by Senator HUTCHISON of Texas, Senator BINGAMAN of New Mexico, Senator LEAHY of Vermont, Senator STABENOW of Michigan, Senator SANTORUM of Pennsylvania, Senator THOMPSON of Tennessee, Senator LANDRIEU of Louisiana, and Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky, and that they be considered en bloc and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL, for themselves and others, proposes amendments numbered 1960 through 1965, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1960

On page 120, line 3, strike "\$1,455,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$1,465,500,000".

On page 121, line 6, after "diseases" insert the following: "of which not less than \$65,000,000 should be made available for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on, tuberculosis".

On page 142, line 17, strike "\$567,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$557,000,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 1961

On page 142, line 17, strike "\$567,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$557,000,000".

On page 124, line 17, strike "\$1,235,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$1,245,000,000".

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

CENTRAL AMERICA DISASTER RELIEF

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated under the headings "International Disaster Assistance", "Development Assistance", and "Economic Support Fund", not less than \$35,000,000 should be made available for relief and reconstruction assistance for victims of earthquakes and drought in El Salvador and elsewhere in Central America.

AMENDMENT NO. 1962

On page 116, line 23, delete "\$753,323,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$727,323,000".

On page 145, line 17, delete "\$326,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$318,500,000".

On page 157, line 3, strike "CONTRIBUTION" and all that follows through the period on line 8.

On page 136, line 9, delete "\$800,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$795,500,000".

On page 128, line 13, delete "\$255,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$245,000,000".

On page 133, line 13, delete "\$603,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$615,000,000".

On page 121, line 5, delete "\$175,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$185,000,000".

On page 121, line 6, after "diseases" insert: "of which not less than \$65,000,000 should be made available to combat malaria".

On page 159, line 13, delete "\$217,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$218,000,000".

On page 160, line 1, delete "\$39,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$40,000,000".

On page 120, line 3, delete "\$1,455,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$1,500,500,000".

On page 120, line 24, delete "\$415,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$450,000,000".

On page 120, line 25, delete "\$40,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$90,000,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 1963

(Purpose: To make agreed technical amendments by the managers of the bill)

On page 232, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

PROJECTS HONORING VICTIMS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS

SEC. 581. The National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.) is amended by inserting before title V the following:

#### "TITLE IV—PROJECTS HONORING VICTIMS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS

"(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'Foundation' means the Points of Light Foundation funded under section 301, or another nonprofit private organization, that enters into an agreement with the Corporation to carry out this section.

"(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS.—

"(1) ESTIMATED NUMBER.—Not later than December 1, 2001, the Foundation, after obtaining the guidance of the heads of appropriate Federal agencies, such as the Director of the Office of Homeland Security and the Attorney General, shall—

"(A) make an estimate of the number of victims killed as a result of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 (referred to in this section as the 'estimated number'); and

"(B) compile a list that specifies, for each individual that the Foundation determines to be such a victim, the name of the victim and the State in which the victim resided.

"(2) IDENTIFIED PROJECTS.—The Foundation shall identify approximately the estimated number of community-based national and community service projects that meet the requirements of subsection (d). The Foundation shall name each identified project in honor of a victim described in subsection

(b)(1)(A), after obtaining the permission of an appropriate member of the victim's family and the entity carrying out the project.

(c) **ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.**—To be eligible to have a project named under this section, the entity carrying out the project shall be a political subdivision of a State, a business, or a nonprofit organization (which may be a religious organization, such as a Christian, Jewish, or Muslim organization).

“(d) **PROJECTS.**—The Foundation shall name, under this section, projects—

“(1) that advance the goals of unity, and improving the quality of life in communities; and

“(2) that will be planned, or for which implementation will begin, within a reasonable period after the date of enactment of this section, as determined by the Foundation.

“(e) **WEBSITE AND DATABASE.**—The Foundation shall create and maintain websites and databases, to describe projects named under this section and serve as appropriate vehicles for recognizing the projects.”.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1964

(Purpose: To make available funds for services aimed at the reintegration of war-affected youth in East Asia)

On page 125, line 16, before the period at the end of the line insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading or under ‘Child Survival and Health Programs Fund’, \$5,000,000 should be made available for activities in South and Central Asia aimed at reintegrating ‘child soldiers’ and other war-affected youth”.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1965

On page 137, line 17 through page 138 line 11, strike all after “(e)” through “assistance”.

#### HIV/AIDS

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, HIV/AIDS has become a world-wide pandemic. More than 16 million people have died of AIDS. The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) and the World Health Organization, WHO, have estimated that over 32.4 million adults and 1.2 million children around the world are already living with HIV. Half of all people who acquire HIV become infected before they turn 25 and typically die of AIDS before their 35th birthday.

The overwhelming majority of people with HIV live in the developing world, and that proportion is likely to grow even further as infection rates continue to rise in countries where poverty, poor health systems, and limited resources for prevention and care fuel the spread of the virus.

Sub-Saharan Africa bears the brunt of HIV and AIDS, with close to 70 percent of the global total of HIV-positive people. Over 14 million Africans have already been claimed by the disease, leaving behind shattered families and crippled prospects for development. There have also been recent reports of growing problems in China, India, and elsewhere. Of course, the United States is not immune to this virus, and its spread globally only contributes to risks in America.

It is estimated that approximately 90 percent of people in sub-Saharan Africa do not know if they are HIV infected or not. They have no means of gaining

this vital knowledge so that they can protect themselves and others. Thus, testing is a critical aspect of the effort to stop the further spread of HIV/AIDS. However, one must be careful that tests are appropriate to the regions where they are used.

In developing regions served by USAID, tests should be fast, accurate, simple, designed to assist those providing counseling, and have no need for labs or refrigeration. The importance of testing cannot be overstated. Early detection of HIV/AIDS might enable treatment to be more effective. We must do all we can to control and stop the spread of this dreaded virus, and I urge USAID to seek to develop rapid tests that serve this purpose.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for bringing up this important issue. I believe that USAID should be committed to furthering the cause of finding a suitable field test for HIV/AIDS. I would expect that of the funds appropriated to USAID, the Agency would evaluate potential tests for deployment in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. LEAHY. I also thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, and agree with him on the importance of testing as an important part of the effort to stop the spread of HIV and AIDS. The bill under consideration includes \$375 million for U.S. Agency for International Development programs to combat HIV/AIDS. It is my belief that a portion of these funds should be committed to the development of rapid tests.

#### HACIA LA SEGURIDAD

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I have a question for Senator McCONNELL, distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, regarding an important rule of law project currently underway in the Andean region. The project is the Hacia la Seguridad project located in Quito, Ecuador.

Mr. McCONNELL. I will be pleased to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. THOMPSON. The mission of the Hacia la Seguridad project is to increase transparency throughout Ecuador's legal system as a means of promoting bureaucratic and judicial accountability, effective governance and law enforcement, and improved access to justice. The project specifically focuses on the identification and elimination of invalid regulations and statutes, the design of modern legal codes, judicial monitoring, and public education and support for rule of law reform. It is my understanding that the Senator supports this project and that it is the intention of the committee that it receive support from USAID.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is correct. The project advances the goals set forth in the International Anti-Corruption and Good Governance Act of 2000 and helps promote stability and democracy in the Andean region generally. It is the committee's intent that this project receive ESF funding in fiscal year 2002.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the Senator for his clarifying statement and ask that the committee seek Statement of Manager's language directing USAID to fund the project.

Mr. McCONNELL. I will be happy to work with the conferees to try to develop Statement of Manager's language advising USAID of this project and its importance.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the Senator for his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 1960 through 1965) were agreed to, en bloc.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, there is one more amendment which we expect will be agreed to by voice vote. We have been working on it all day. It is about to miraculously appear from back in the Cloakroom. It is related to the Armenia-Azerbaijan dispute.

I say to my colleagues, we will be able to agree to that shortly, we believe on a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1921

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1921.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] proposes an amendment numbered 1921.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1921

(Purpose: To authorize the President to waive the restriction of assistance for Azerbaijan if the President determines that it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so)

On page 232, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

#### WAIVER OF RESTRICTION ON ASSISTANCE TO AZERBAIJAN.

SEC. 581. Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act (Public Law 102-511; 22 U.S.C. 5812 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “United States” and inserting “(a) RESTRICTION.—United States”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **WAIVER.**—The President is authorized to waive the restriction in subsection (a) if the President determines that it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so.”.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1966 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1921

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a second-degree amendment to the Brownback amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1966 to amendment No. 1921.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO NO. 1966 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1921

Strike all after the word Sec. and add the following:

Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act shall not apply to—

(A) activities to support democracy or assistance under Title V of the FREEDOM Support Act and section 1424 of Public Law 104-201 or nonproliferation assistance;

(B) any assistance provided by the Trade and Development Agency under section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2421);

(C) any activity carried out by a member of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service while acting within his or her official capacity;

(D) any insurance, reinsurance, guarantee or other assistance provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation under title IV of Chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2191 et seq.);

(E) any financing provided under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; or

(F) humanitarian assistance.

(2) The President may waive section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act if he determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that to do so:

(A) is necessary to support United States efforts to counter terrorism; or

(B) is necessary to support the operational readiness of United States Armed Forces or coalition partners to counter terrorism; or

(C) is important to Azerbaijan's border security; and

(D) will not undermine or hamper ongoing efforts to negotiate a peaceful settlement between Armenia and Azerbaijan or be used for offensive purposes against Armenia.

(3) The authority of paragraph (2) may only be exercised through December 31, 2002.

(4) The President may extend the waiver authority provided in paragraph (2) on an annual basis on or after December 31, 2002 if he determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2).

(5) The Committees on Appropriations shall be consulted prior to the provisions of any assistance made available pursuant to paragraph (2).

(6) Within 60 days of any exercise of the authority under Section (2), the President shall send a report to the appropriate Congressional committees specifying in detail the following:

(A) The nature and quantity of all training and assistance provided to the government of Azerbaijan pursuant to Section (2);

(B) the status of the military balance between Azerbaijan and Armenia and the impact of U.S. assistance on that balance; and

(C) the status of negotiations for a peaceful settlement between Armenia and Azerbaijan and the impact of U.S. assistance on those negotiations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Madam President, I want to speak in favor of the amendment put forward by my colleague from Kentucky. As he mentioned, this is a contentious, difficult issue on which people have been working all day. We have gotten to an agreement of what we think can work.

Basically, the issue is trying to prosecute the war on terrorism. I think we have been able to work some issues out to be able to get that done. I am very appreciative of all my colleagues, particularly the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. McCONNELL, and the Senator from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, and a number of other people for working aggressively on it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of support on this issue from the Secretary of State, Colin Powell, and ask it be printed in the RECORD along with a letter from three former National Security Advisers to Senator DASCHLE and Senator LOTT in support of this amendment we are putting forward.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, October 15, 2001.

Hon. JESSE A. HELMS,  
Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: The President has asked me to request your support for providing legislative authority that would allow assistance to the Republic of Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan has joined the coalition to combat terrorism and has granted the United States overflight rights, the use of its air bases, and has provided critical intelligence cooperation. Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act of 1992, however, severely constrains our ability to provide most support to the Government of Azerbaijan including assistance needed to support our operations in the ongoing war against terrorism.

In addition to purely military matters, no less urgent is our need to engage and assist Azerbaijan's intelligence and law enforcement agencies. It is also imperative that we assist and work with Azerbaijan's financial authorities to track and disrupt assets of the terror network. The campaign's evolution will probably bring other requirements to the fore that we will need flexibility to address.

I request your assistance in passing legislation that would provide a national security interest waiver from the restrictions of section 907. Removal of these restrictions will allow the United States to provide necessary military assistance that will enable Azerbaijan to counter terrorist organizations and elements operating within its borders. This type of assistance is a critical element of the United States fight against global terrorism.

Sincerely,

COLIN L. POWELL.  
OCTOBER 17, 2001.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,  
Majority Leader,  
U.S. Senate.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,  
Minority Leader,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE AND SENATOR LOTT: Now that the United States has been compelled to undertake a comprehensive world war against terrorism, it is imperative that we ensure that our President benefits from the diplomatic flexibility and military capacities necessary to succeed decisively in this war.

The first front of this war is the Caucasus and Central Asia. Fostering and solidifying enduring partnerships with the countries of this region is a strategic and operational imperative.

For this reason, we urge you to support the repeal of an archaic sanction against Azer-

baijan, a country whose cooperation will be no less vital than any of its neighbors. Azerbaijan was among the first countries to condemn the September 11th attacks. It has offered the United States military overflight rights and the use of its military bases in this war against terrorism.

However, Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act prohibits the United States from benefitting from this offer. Unless Section 907 is repealed, our military will not be able to cooperate with Azerbaijan's security forces to create capacities that will increase not only our ability to strike against terrorist targets, but also our ability to provide much needed security and logistical support to U.S. forces operating in that region.

There is not a doubt that Azerbaijan is ready and willing to be a full ally in the war against terrorism. Ironically, it is not Azerbaijan's will, but an archaic legislative provision that precludes the United States from accepting Baku's hand of partnership. This is not only a diplomatic loss, it is strike against our men and women in uniform now conducting a military offensive in Afghanistan against Al Qaeda and the Taliban.

For these strategic and operational reasons, we urge you to support the repeal of Section 907. Doing so will help to maximize America's ability to wage the war on terrorism.

Respectfully,

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI.  
BRENT SCOWCROFT.  
ANTHONY LAKE.

Mr. BROWNBAC. I don't know if there is further need for us to debate on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his tenacity in advocating his point of view. He and I and the Senator from Maryland have had some great debates on the issue of section 907 of the Freedom of Support Act in previous Congresses, but I do believe we have been able to work out an approach that both allows the administration to engage with these areas in a way that facilitates the fighting of the war and also preserves section 907 to be dealt with at a later date when the final settlement comes between Armenia and Azerbaijan, which will obviously happen on another day. I think this is a compromise that is worthwhile, and I am happy to support it.

I yield the floor. I see Senator KERRY here, the original author of section 907.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I will be very brief. I thank Senator SARBANES for his strong commitment to trying to balance this properly and for his tenacity through the course of the day. His leadership has been really superb in helping to try to balance the interests.

I thank Senator BROWNBAC for understanding what we have been trying to achieve. As the original author of 907, obviously I am sensitive to the change. But I completely understand the circumstances in which we find ourselves. These are changed circumstances. We need to respond, and we need to respond thoughtfully.

My hope is that the amendment we have put in that was just adopted a

moment ago, which Senator MCCONNELL sponsored on our behalf, adequately sets forth the balance we are trying to strike so the long-term interests of peace and of the peaceful negotiations, bringing people to the table representing all parties' interests, will be respected.

I hope we have achieved that. Obviously, there is more to play out. We will watch this very closely as we go forward.

I thank Senator MCCONNELL for his efforts today, and Senator SARBANES. Hopefully, the balance we have tried to achieve has been achieved.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I am confident if the dispute between Azerbaijan and Armenia is not settled on some other day that the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Massachusetts and I will be allies in this fight on another day. I think for today we have worked out a compromise which is acceptable to the administration and which is acceptable to Senator BROWNBACK and is the best we can achieve at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts.

There is not a settlement of a long-standing dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan. It is really an attempt for us to be able to work to deal with terrorism and work with the country we need to work with in this case; that is, Azerbaijan.

The language is being drafted very carefully so that we can work in our best interests in the United States fighting terrorism with the assistance of being able to land planes and to house planes, and personnel being treated in hospitals in Azerbaijan, should we need to. Indeed, some of that is taking place now. We have tried carefully to pull that together without touching the issue of peace talks which need to proceed. I hope we can get a final settlement of that sometime soon.

Do we have time for a vote? If not, we don't need a recorded vote but a voice, I hope.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the second degree, No. 1966.

The amendment (No. 1966) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the first degree, as amended, No. 1921.

The amendment (No. 1921), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1967

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have one final amendment related to the United States-Armenia relationship that would provide some assistance for Armenia. It has been approved on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1967.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 152 line 10, after the word "Appropriations" and before the period insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated by this paragraph, not less than \$600,000 shall be made available for assistance for Armenia"

On page 153 line 7, after the colon insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated by this paragraph, not less than \$4,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Armenia"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1967) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1968

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, we have another amendment on behalf of the Senator from Oregon, Mr. SMITH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for Mr. SMITH of Oregon, proposes an amendment numbered 1968.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

#### SEC. . FEDERAL INVESTIGATION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2001.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Federal Investigation Enhancement Act of 2001."

(b) UNDERCOVER INVESTIGATIVE PRACTICES CONDUCTED BY FEDERAL ATTORNEYS.—Section 530 B (a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence, "Notwithstanding any provision of State law, including disciplinary rules, statutes, regulations, constitutional provisions, or case law, a Government attorney may, for the purpose of enforcing Federal law, provide legal advice, authorization, concurrence, direction, or supervision on conducting undercover activities, and any attorney employed as an investigator or other law enforcement agent by the Department of Justice who is not authorized to represent the United

States in criminal or civil law enforcement litigation or to supervise such proceedings may participate in such activities, even though such activities may require the use of deceit or misrepresentation, where such activities are consistent with Federal law."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1968) was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

#### GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I would like to address the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations on the subject of the Global Environment Facility, an organization which for a number of reasons is vital to the restoration and preservation of our earth's environment. The GEF channels funding from over 30 nations to help developing countries confront the problems within their borders which affect the global environment. Traditionally, GEF's focus has been on global warming, biodiversity, international waters, and the ozone layer.

Recently, the GEF was given a critical new assignment. It is now the funding mechanism to implement the new international conservation on persistent organic pollutants, or POPs, which was signed by the United States and other nations in June. Though long banned in the U.S., these toxic chemicals continue to be used in the developing world. They travel on air and water currents and work their way up the food chain into humans, particularly native populations in northern latitudes like Alaska. As the funding mechanism for the POPs convention, GEF will have a critical role in phasing out their use.

I greatly appreciate the efforts of the subcommittee chairman to provide slightly more than the President's request for the GEF this year. However, I had been hopeful that the Congress would be able to provide not only the budget request, but significantly more to pay off existing arrears. In June I joined Senators CHAFEE, BIDEN, BINGAMAN, COLLINS, JEFFORDS, LIEBERMAN, LUGAR, MURRAY, and SNOWE in writing to the subcommittee leadership urging the payment of a substantial amount of our arrears.

Mr. LEAHY. I appreciate the support of the Senator from Massachusetts for our proposed increase over the President's budget request for the GEF. I agree that this is a vital organization. GEF's work gets at many of the international environmental problems which simply cannot be fixed by the U.S. or any nation acting alone, such as global warming.

Poor nations which struggle to feed and clothe their people simply do not have the resources to devote to global environmental problems. Yet if we do not have a unified global approach to these problems, we have little hope of addressing them effectively. The GEF funds worthy projects in 160 countries.

Unfortunately, the United States has lagged behind in meeting our obligations to the GEF. Since 1994, twice the U.S. has pledged \$107.5 million a year to GEF. We are now in the final year of the second replenishment, and our total arrears stand at \$203.9 million. Our recommended appropriation this year will make only a small dent in that figure, but at least will not add to them.

Mr. KERRY. I have been a part of international environmental discussions for a decade, and attended talks not only in Kyoto but also in Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires and The Hague. During this time, I have watched tensions grow between the developed and developing world, which increasingly views Western efforts to convince them to adopt strict environmental standards as an effort to hold them down economically. This concern is an important factor in the dispute over a new round of world trade negotiations. Cooperative efforts between developed nations and the developing world through organizations like the Global Environmental Facility can bridge this distrust.

Mr. LEAHY. I agree with the Senator. I am pleased that the Senate is recommending a considerably higher appropriation than the House for the GEF, and I intend to work diligently to persuade the House to agree to our GEF number in conference. We must get back on track and pay our arrears to the GEF.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chairman. This year's appropriations debate coincides with new discussions among GEF members for a new replenishment, one which must for the first time accommodate the new responsibility for implementing POPS. Hence it's critical that the U.S. send a strong statement that we remain committed to meeting our obligations to the GEF.

#### AMERICAN COMPANIES DOING BUSINESS IN COLOMBIA

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, we often hear from American companies whose investments in developing countries have gone sour. That is the risk of doing business, and nobody disputes that. But international arbitration was created in order to mitigate the risks of overseas investments and to avoid depending on shaky legal institutions in those countries. Arbitration has been one of the principal building blocks to the extraordinary growth in international trade. It has brought investments to countries which would have otherwise been considered too risky because it gives investors and sovereign nations an agreed-upon mechanism to resolve disputes. Key to its success is the agreement by all parties that arbitration can only work if it is binding.

It recently came to Senator McConnell's and my attention that at least two American companies, Sithe and Nortel, have participated in binding arbitration to resolve disputes with the Colombian Government. According to

information we have received, Sithe and perhaps Nortel, we are told, companies from Mexico and Germany, have won awards through binding arbitration, only to have the Colombian Government renege on its commitment to honor the arbitration decision.

We have not had an opportunity to discuss these matters with the Colombian Government, but if our information is correct, that American companies have agreed to binding arbitration and prevailed, only to have the Colombian Government refuse to pay, that is unacceptable. We want to help Colombia's economy develop in an environment where the rule of law is respected. This is crucial to Colombia's future. If Colombia flaunts the rules of the private market, it will have increasing difficulty attracting private investment because it cannot be trusted.

Representatives of these companies have urged us to withhold a portion of U.S. assistance to Colombia until the Colombian Government fulfills its legal obligations to these companies. We considered offering such an amendment, because of the importance we give to the fair treatment of American companies, respect for the rule of law, and the international arbitration process. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of our proposed amendment be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

We decided not to offer the amendment, because of the precedent it could set. But we want to emphasize that respecting binding, internationally, sanctioned arbitration is essential to the investment that will ultimately be the engine for Colombia's economic development. No amount of foreign assistance can do that. The pattern of Colombia's apparent abuse of the international arbitration process is very disturbing, and by conveying our concern about it we mean to strongly encourage the Colombian Government to act expeditiously to resolve these matters.

I know that both Senator McConnell and I will be following this issue closely, and discussing it with the Colombian Ambassador, the American Ambassador to Colombia, and the Department of State, in the coming months.

Mr. McConnell. Let me just add a word or two to Senator Leahy's comments. Few would disagree that Colombia's long term political and economic development resides in its ability to forge a lasting peace, establish the rule of law, and attract foreign investment. No service is done to the nation or the people of Colombia when the Colombian government refuses to recognize the legitimacy of an arbitration award to international businesses. The leadership in Bogota should understand that such action further erodes confidence in the overall investment climate in Colombia within the international business community—and in foreign capitals. It is my hope that the Colombian government takes note of the

amendment Senator Leahy and I contemplated offering and initiates corrective action in the very near future.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, as the Senate considers the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss discrepancies between the House and Senate versions regarding funding for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY).

I have strong reservations about certain language included by the House Appropriations Committee in its report accompanying H.R. 2506. In its report, the House Committee recommends \$145 million in funding for the FRY, of which \$60 million is to be provided to Montenegro. I support at least \$145 million for the FRY, which is the amount requested by the President. However, if the House funding level stands for Montenegro, with a population of just 600,000 people, which is one-thirteenth the size of Serbia, it would receive more than 40 percent of the total assistance package for the FRY.

I do not believe Montenegro could constructively absorb this much assistance, and I am concerned about the impact such a division of assistance for the FRY would have on U.S. assistance to Serbia. In my conversations with State Department officials, they also expressed strong reservations about providing \$60 million to Montenegro, as they believe it is more than Montenegro can effectively absorb. The State Department believes Montenegro should not receive more than the \$45 million recommended by the Senate, and in fact, they believe that \$35–40 million would be an appropriate amount.

Given disturbing reports of official corruption that have surfaced regarding illicit activity in Montenegro, it is particularly important that we are able to fully account for the expenditure of U.S. assistance there. Moreover, if the House recommendation of \$60 million prevails, U.S. assistance for the Republic of Serbia could fall to \$85 million, which is significantly below the \$100 million we provided to Serbia in fiscal year 2001.

As my colleagues are aware, significant changes have taken place in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia during the past twelve months. On Friday October 5, 2001, marked the one-year anniversary of the fall of the Milosevic regime and the beginning of a new, democratic government. Since then, the new leaders have made significant strides in implementing political and economic reforms. While there is still much work to be done, it is critical that we recognize the important progress that has been made in the past year. A cut in funding for Serbia would send precisely the wrong message. We want to support the Serb reformers, who took the courageous step of arresting and transferring Slobodan Milosevic to The Hague. We want to encourage their continued cooperation with the War Crimes Tribunal, as well

as other democratic reforms and re-  
spect for the rule of law.

When the conference committee meets to reconcile the House and Senate versions of the foreign operations bill for fiscal year 2002, I urge the Senate conferees to support the funding levels for Serbia and Montenegro that are recommended in the Senate bill.

I would appreciate knowing if the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee agree with me about this.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, for far too long, corruption has been allowed to run rampant in Southeastern Europe. Recent events have highlighted the citizens of Montenegro as being among the most beleaguered by the corruption of its government.

Montenegro is the beneficiary of a proud, freedom loving people courageously standing against the tyranny of Slobodan Milosevic. However, they have not been well served by their government, whose actions have undercut United States assistance to Montenegro.

For example, the President of Montenegro purchases two luxury aircrafts, during the Kosovo Crisis! Costing 26 to 30 million dollars or more, one plane was a Lear Jet, and the other a Cessna Citation X. President Djukanovic has been flown in these planes at the very same time the taxpayers of the United States were making emergency cash payments to help the Montenegrin Government pay its pensions and energy bills.

The \$26 million spent on aircraft would have averted electricity power shortages in Montenegro. These purchases, by the way, were not reported to the United States Government, the Montenegrin Parliament which is now investigating this matter, or, the citizens of Montenegro.

It is now clear that the Government of Montenegro was keeping two budgets: one facilitated the flow of international assistance; the second apparently served the personal interests of senior government officials.

Since actions speak louder than words, it is obvious that a premium was placed on personal comfort of senior officials over legal reforms essential to rebuilding the Montenegrin economy.

Last year the United States earmarked \$89 million in foreign assistance for fiscal year 2001 for Montenegro; plans are to dedicate about half that much in fiscal year 2002.

Let me be clear, United States assistance must never be permitted to be a free ride for such officials. The citizens of Montenegro fought Milosevic to the very end. Now develops that, during that time, they, and the United States, were cheated by the government in Podgorica.

The people deserve a responsible governing body that puts foreign assistance into its economy not the pockets of corrupt officials. The United States deserves assurance that United States

assistance dollars are used for their intended purpose.

Not one red cent should go to the government of Montenegro unless and until these planes have been fully accounted for—and sold. In addition, United States assistance to the Montenegrin government should be firmly conditioned upon tangible progress toward rooting out corruption and re-introducing the rule of law.

The people of Montenegro deserve far better than they have received from their government and their President Djukanovic.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friends from Ohio and North Carolina for bringing to the attention of the Senate the important issue of assistance to Serbia and Montenegro. The short answer to Senator VOINOVICH's inquiry is that Senator LEAHY and I strongly support the funding levels for Serbia and Montenegro that are recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee, and that will be our position in the Conference.

Those of us who closely follow developments in the Balkans appreciate the many challenges that reformers in Serbia and Montenegro face each day, and we note the progress that has been made in the past year alone. As Senators VOINOVICH and HELMS have stated, many challenges lie ahead, including the need to address the troubling and complex issues of corruption and legal reform. I think we all agree that America must be clear in our support of these reform efforts. Senator LEAHY and I believe that the carefully drafted provisions in our bill, and the funding levels we recommend, do just that.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank my friends for their comments. This is an issue of great importance to the Senate. In crafting this bill, Senator MCCONNELL and I had three principal objectives with respect to the FRY. First, we want to send a message to Serb reformers that we strongly support their efforts. We recommend \$115 million for Serbia in fiscal year 2002, a \$15 million increase in United States assistance above last year. We have also provided authority for debt relief for Serbia. We were told by Serb finance officials and our Treasury Department that this is a top priority if Serbia is to attract new foreign investment, which is the key to Serbia's future economic development.

Second, we want to make clear that we expect to see continued cooperation with the War Crimes Tribunal and respect for the rule of law. While we fully appreciate the courage of Serb officials in arresting and transferring Milosevic to The Hague in April, since then we have seen little in the way of cooperation with the Tribunal. We are also disappointed that political prisoners continue to languish in Serb jails, even though Serb officials have acknowledged that they should be released. We therefore include language similar to last year, that links our assistance to continued progress in these areas.

Finally, with respect to Montenegro, we want to provide sufficient assist-

ance to convey our strong support for Montenegro, and at the same time ensure a proper balance within the \$115 million available for the FRY. Montenegro is making impressive strides in reforming its economy, and we should support that. The reports of corruption are disturbing, and we need to ensure that our assistance is not misused. Unfortunately, corruption is a region-wide phenomenon, and we have emphasized to USAID and the State Department that combating corruption should be a key component of our assistance relationship. Corruption corrodes democracy, and the new leaders of Montenegro and Serbia, and indeed throughout the former Yugoslavia, will pay a heavy price in the long run if they ignore it.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I rise to offer for the RECORD the Budget Committee's official scoring for H.R. 2506, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002.

The Senate bill provides \$15.524 billion in discretionary budget authority, which will result in new outlays in 2002 of \$5.580 billion. When outlays from prior-year budget authority are taken into account, discretionary, outlays for the Senate bill total \$15.149 billion in 2002. The Senate bill is at its Section 302(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. Once again, the committee has met its target without the use of any emergency designations.

We have begun the 2002 fiscal year without the Congress completing a single appropriations bill. While extraordinary events have contributed greatly to this late start, it is time that the Congress complete its work. Earlier this month, the President reached agreement with Senate and House appropriators on a revised budget for 2002. The Congress must now expeditiously provide funding that complies with that bipartisan agreement.

I ask for unanimous consent that a table displaying the budget committee scoring of this bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 2506, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATION ACT, 2002, SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE REPORTED BILL

(In millions of dollars)

	General purpose	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:			
Budget Authority .....	15,524	45	15,569
Outlays .....	15,149	45	15,194
Senate 302(b) allocation: <sup>1</sup>			
Budget Authority .....	15,524	45	15,569
Outlays .....	15,149	45	15,194
House-passed:			
Budget Authority .....	15,167	45	15,212
Outlays .....	15,080	45	15,125
President's request:			
Budget Authority .....	15,169	45	15,214
Outlays .....	15,081	45	15,126
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:			
Senate 302(b) allocation: <sup>1</sup>			
Budget Authority .....	0	0	0
Outlays .....	0	0	0
House-passed:			
Budget Authority .....	357	0	357

H.R. 2506, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATION ACT, 2002, SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE REPORTED BILL—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	General purpose	Mandatory	Total
Outlays .....	69	0	69
President's request:			
Budget Authority .....	355	0	355
Outlays .....	68	0	68

<sup>1</sup> For enforcement purposes, the budget committee compares the Senate-reported bill to the Senate 302(b) allocation.

Notes.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I want to take a moment to speak briefly about two interconnected issues—the destruction of the world's few remaining tropical forests, and the pressures of population growth, poverty, and development that is causing it.

The world's few remaining tropical forests, which are located in Indonesia, Central Africa, and parts of South America, are being cut down at a staggering rate. Whether it is local farmers scratching out a living by slash and burn agriculture, or multinational timber or mining companies, experts predict that these irreplaceable ecosystems will be completely gone in 15 to 20 years.

The forests are not just trees. They are the habitat for the majority of the Earth's endangered species, from great apes to insects, many of which we have yet to identify. They are also the source of many of the life-saving drugs that are sold in America's pharmacies today, and who knows how many future cures wait to be discovered from rainforest plants.

They are home to the few remaining groups of indigenous people who continue to live in much the same way as they have for centuries, threatening no one.

Development is widely regarded as synonymous with progress. That is why the United States Agency for International Development has its name. But it would be unforgivable if a decade or two from now the few remaining virgin tropical forests were gone. It is not simply a matter of planting new trees. They are a complex web of species.

There are many private homes in Washington, DC that are worth more than what it would cost to protect hundreds of thousands of acres of virgin rainforest in some African countries. Yet we have difficulty finding a few million dollars to do that.

Even worse, the United States is a major consumer of timber stolen from the forests of Indonesia, Africa and South America. According to a recent report, the U.S. imported over \$300 million in illegal timber from Indonesia alone last year.

The international trade in illegal timber is out of control. It is rampant. It is accelerating, and it is driven by greed, an insatiable demand, corruption, and the lack of effective strategies and resources to address it. This

bill contains funds to increase our efforts, but I would be the first to say is not enough.

There are two ways to protect these forests, and both are essential. One is law enforcement. Many countries, like Indonesia and Brazil have environmental laws, but they are routinely violated, including by those who are responsible for enforcing them.

In Indonesia, the military is deeply involved in the illegal timber trade, and I encouraged the White House to discuss this with President Megawati when she was in Washington recently.

The same is true in Cambodia and the so-called "Democratic" Republic of the Congo. The military trades protection for illegal loggers in exchange for a slice of the profits. So cracking down on this corruption is essential.

What also must be done is to provide the people who live in the forests alternative sources of income and access to family planning to reduce population pressures on these fragile ecosystems.

As it is, they have no other way to survive except by cutting the trees for fuel or timber and killing the animals for bush meat, which has become a high priced delicacy.

Once the forests are gone, they will have to abandon their homes, joining the throngs of other impoverished people migrating to urban slums—without housing, without jobs, without health care, without hope.

On the other hand, if they are made to understand that the forest and the animals can be a continuing source of tourist income, then they become the protectors of the forests.

We want USAID to expand its support for organizations and individuals who have devoted their lives to protecting endangered species and the tropical forests where they live.

In some countries, like Brazil, some of the most courageous advocates for the environment have been murdered, presumably by the mining and timber interests.

There is still time to stop this, but only if we make it a priority. We have to, because ten years from now will be too late.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, as the Senate considers the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2002, I would like to take a few minutes to address U.S. assistance to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

As many of my colleagues are aware, I have taken a strong interest in issues affecting Southeast Europe during my time in the Senate. I have made many trips to the region, most recently in December of 2000 with my friend from Pennsylvania Senator ARLEN SPECTER, and I continue to meet with the region's political, spiritual and community leaders both in the United States and during time abroad.

I have long recognized the destabilizing influence that men such as Slobodan Milosevic have had on the region and the broader European community. The international community

witnessed the devastating influence of this so-called leader during years of violent conflict in the former Yugoslavia, and we continue to see evidence of its affects in Kosovo and other parts of the region.

While the Balkans have not been without recent challenges, as demonstrated by the situation in Macedonia and continued violence and destruction in Kosovo and parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina, significant changes have taken place in this part of the world during the past year and a half. The death of Franjo Tudjman in Croatia in December of 1999 and the ouster of the Milosevic regime in October of 2000 have removed major obstacles to positive change in the region.

One year ago this month, I watched with tremendous gratification when the people of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia went to the polls, and then to the streets, to demonstrate their support of democracy and their denouncement of Milosevic.

Since my days as mayor of Cleveland and Governor of the State of Ohio, I have been an ardent supporter of democratic reformers in Serbia. I have long admired the courage and determination of many individuals who remained focused on a democratic future for Serbia, whatever the odds, such as members of the OTPOR student movement.

When I met with a group of these young leaders following the election of President Vojislav Kostunica and the removal of Milosevic from power, they told me that the feat we witnessed last October would not have been possible without the support and influence of the United States.

Just a few weeks ago in my office in the Hart building, I met with one of the founders of the OPTOR student movement, who is now a member of the Serbian Parliament. Once focused on removing Milosevic from power, he is now intent on helping the government to strength its democratic institutions so that the FRY may better position itself among Europe's new democracies. Without a doubt, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is a different place today than it was one year ago.

When the Senate considered the foreign operations bill last year, we conditioned U.S. assistance to Serbia after March 31, 2001 on three conditions. In order to receive continued non-humanitarian assistance, the United States had to certify that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was doing the following: First, cooperating with the War Crimes Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia; next, taking steps to implement the Dayton Accords; and finally, taking steps to implement policies reflecting the rule of law and respect for human rights.

Given the importance of a democratic and stable government in the FRY to the broader region and Europe as a whole, I was pleased that the new government was, in fact, making significant progress in the areas outlined

in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001, thus allowing President Bush and the Secretary of State to grant certification and allow non-humanitarian U.S. assistance to the FRY to continue following the March 31 deadline.

Additionally, the FRY's progress facilitated help from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and the international community pledged more than \$1.2 billion for the country during a donors' conference sponsored by the World Bank at the end of June. Most recently, we have seen positive developments in the FRY's negotiations with the Paris Club to reschedule a portion of its debt.

The reforms took important action in each of the three areas. Regarding cooperation with the War Crimes Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, we all remember the dramatic scenes on television during the days before Slobodan Milosevic was transferred to The Hague in the middle of the night. It was a courageous and necessary step, and I am pleased that the government understood the necessity to doing so.

In efforts to implement policies reflecting the rule of law and respect for human rights, perhaps the most significant accomplishment demonstrating the government's actions involved its work with the international community to successfully resolve the situation in southern Serbia, without significant international incident. In line with the Dayton Agreement, the FRY has reduced its military to military ties with the Republic Srpska, and it has indicated its commitment to eliminate remaining ties and ensure transparency of any dealings it might have with the Republic Srpska in the future.

While we acknowledge the positive things that have taken place during the past twelve months, we must also recognize the reality that is still work that remain to be done. Of highest priority is the release of ethnic Albanian prisoners who continue to remain incarcerated in Serbian jails. Moreover, it is critical that the Government further its cooperation with The Hague War Crimes Tribunal. Certainly the transfer of Milosevic was highly important; at the same time, other indicated war criminals remain at large in the FRY, and every effort should be made to work with The Hague Tribunal to rid the country of those responsible for past atrocities.

That being said, as the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia joins the ranks of southeast Europe's new democracies, I believe it is important that we begin to look beyond the conditions outlined in the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001, and work to create an assistance program for the FRY that is in line with our aid programs to other countries in the region.

Last October, when House and Senate conferees considered the final version of the fiscal year 2001 foreign operations spending bill. Vojislav Kostunica had been in office just a few

short weeks. The status of Milosevic was widely unknown. Given the nascent state of the new government at that time, I believe including language allowing the United States flexibility in its assistance program to the FRY, should the new government have moved in a direction contrary to U.S. interests, was a reasonable thing to do.

However, in the year following final consideration of last year's foreign operations appropriations bill, I believe the reformers in the FRY have developed a position—though not perfect—track record. While it is clear that additional steps must be taken to further cooperation with The Hague and implementation of the rule of law, I believe we have solid evidence that the new government is committed to moving forward with reforms. If they fail to make the progress they have promised, we have many avenues from which to demonstrate our displeasure.

As my colleagues are aware, the State Department must notify Congress before distributing U.S. funds abroad. At that time, our Foreign Relations Committee or Foreign Operations Subcommittee can withhold assistance to any country abroad. Additionally, we may instruct U.S. representatives to international organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to withhold their support for programs benefiting the FRY. Finally, if the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia does not act in accordance with actions deemed to be in their best interests by the United States and other members of the international community, there is no doubt in my mind that future U.S. support will be terminated.

I appreciate the work that my colleagues on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee have done in preparing the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2002. I recognize their efforts to send a positive message to reformers in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia by increasing the level of assistance to Serbia to \$115 million for fiscal year 2002, which is \$15 million above the fiscal year 2001 level, and providing \$45 million for Montenegro.

Further, the committee has included language in its report applauding the work that has been done by reformers in the FRY during the past year. I also strongly support my colleagues' decision to provide \$28 million toward debt relief for the FRY, and I was pleased to join Senator LEAHY and Senator MCCONNELL as a cosponsor of an amendment authorizing that authority.

While I support many provisions in the bill, I am nonetheless concerned that the same conditions on U.S. assistance to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia that were crafted in October 2000, just weeks after the change of government, appear in the bill one year later. It is my feeling that placing the same conditions on U.S. assistance to FRY now may send the wrong message to the country's reformers. While we

should continue to encourage progress in the FRY, I believe placing the same three conditions on U.S. aid to the country year after year could be counterproductive.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee and the Foreign Relations Committee during the next year regarding developments in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as our aid program to the country evolves, with the hope that we will be able to move beyond conditionality in years to come.

While it is important for the United States to understand progress that is made in the FRY, it is also imperative that the leaders of the FRY understand that the actions they take on the three areas outlined in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for FY2001 will have a dramatic impact on whether or not the conditions are included in next year's bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, one of the most important provisions in this legislation conditions assistance to the Colombian Armed Forces on improvements in human rights.

It is essential to ensure that U.S. military aid does not contribute to human rights abuses in Colombia. Allegations of human rights violations by military personnel there have decreased, but the State Department's 2000 Country Report on Human Rights Practices concluded that the Colombian Government's human rights record "remained poor" and that "government security forces continued to commit serious abuses, including extrajudicial killings."

Many of us are particularly concerned about persistent links between the Colombian Armed Forces and illegal paramilitary groups. On September 10, Secretary of State Powell included the largest of these groups, known by its acronym as the AUC, on the State Department's list of terrorist groups. According to the State Department's Human Rights report, the Colombian military has repeatedly reassured our government "that it would not tolerate collaboration" with such groups and that "the army would combat paramilitary groups." However, the report concludes that such links persist and that "actions in the field were not always consistent with the leadership's positions."

The report says:

Members of the security forces collaborated with paramilitary groups that committed abuses, in some instances allowing such groups to pass through roadblocks, sharing information, or providing them with supplies or ammunition. Despite increased government efforts to combat and capture members of paramilitary groups, often security forces failed to take action to prevent paramilitary attacks. Paramilitary forces find a ready support base within the military and police, as well as among local civilian elites in many areas.

A report recently released by Human Rights Watch titled "The Sixth Division: Military-Paramilitary Ties and U.S. Policy in Colombia," states that

the Colombia military and police detachments continue to promote, work with, support profit from, and tolerate paramilitary groups, treating them as a force allied to and compatible with their own.

Paramilitary groups continue to be linked to most human rights violations committed in Colombia, including massacres. The State Department's Human Rights report cites a sharp increase in the number of victims of paramilitary violence in the last year. Just two weeks ago, a new and ruthless massacre was committed by the AUC in Colombia. At least twenty-four men were forced to lie on the ground and then were executed one by one in cold blood.

Many of us are deeply concerned that a majority of the armed forces personnel who collaborate with the paramilitary organizations and who are responsible for human rights abuses are not prosecuted effectively. According to the State Department's report, "impunity for military personnel who collaborated with members of paramilitary groups remained common." Although the Colombian government claims to have dismissed more than 500 members of the military, the State Department says that it does not know how many were dismissed for collaborating with illegal paramilitary groups.

The conditions included in this legislation are intended to address these concerns. They require the Secretary of State to certify that the Colombian Armed Forces are suspending members who have been credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights, including extra-judicial killings, or to have aided or abetted paramilitary groups, and are providing to civilian prosecutors and judicial authorities requested information on the nature and cause of the suspension.

The conditions require the Secretary of State to certify that the Colombian Armed Forces are cooperating with civilian prosecutors and judicial authorities, including unimpeded access to witnesses and relevant military documents and other information, in prosecuting and punishing in civilian courts members of the armed forces who have been credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights, including extra-judicial killings, or to have aided or abetted paramilitary groups.

Finally, the conditions require the Secretary of State to certify that the Colombian Armed Forces are taking effective steps to sever links, including denying access to military intelligence, vehicles, and other equipment or supplies, ceasing other forms of active or tacit cooperation with paramilitary groups, and carrying out existing arrest warrants.

These conditions will help ensure that U.S. assistance does not contribute to human rights violations in Colombia. I urge my colleagues to support these important provisions.

Another important provision is intended to improve the lives of the Dalit in India.

India's 160 million Dalits, who are also known as "untouchables," suffer severe hardship and face a unique form of discrimination. As victims of economic exploitation rooted in the caste system, they are virtually excluded from Indian society and endure some of the worst health conditions in the world. Dalits are born poor and landless and face discrimination at almost every stage in life. Wages from their jobs rarely provide enough income to feed their families or educate their children, and so the cycle of poverty and illiteracy continues from generation to generation.

In rural areas, where sewer systems are virtually non-existent, many Dalits make their living cleaning human waste. These workers, known as scavengers, use little more than a broom, a tin plate and a basket, they clear human waste from public and private latrines, and carry the waste long distances in porous wicker baskets to disposal sites. In urban areas, they often work neck-deep in pits filled with human waste and risk asphyxiation in city sewers. Health conditions are appalling. Nearly all of these workers are women, and some are children.

A Dalit in India once described their existence:

When we are working, they ask us not to come near them. At tea canteens, they have separate tea tumblers and they make us clean them ourselves and make us put the dishes away ourselves. We cannot enter temples. We cannot use upper-caste water taps. We have to go one kilometer away to get water. . . .

Dalit communities are frequently punished for individual transgressions. With little knowledge of their rights, limited access to attorneys, and no money for hearings or bail, they are easy targets for criminal prosecution. Police single out Dalit activists for persecution and frequently abuse and torture Dalit suspects.

While the Indian Constitution and the 1955 Civil Rights Act abolished untouchability, and subsequent laws allow for affirmative action, hiring quotas and special training funds, discrimination against Dalits continues to flourish in Indian society. As the great author of the Indian constitution—and Dalit—statesman Dr. Ambedkar once said: "Mahatmas have come, Mahatmas have gone but the Untouchables have remained as Untouchables."

While there are many people of goodwill in India, discrimination and poverty are widespread in the Dalit community. The foreign aid we provide to India should contribute to easing the hardship and misery suffered by this community and to addressing the disparity between Dalits and others in India.

To advance this objective, a provision in this legislation requires the executive director of the World Bank to

vote against any water or sewage project in India that does not prohibit the use of scavenger labor. Precious and limited resources should be used to provide incentive to communities in India to abolish this kind of labor and to reward those that do so.

Additionally, the report accompanying the Senate bill highlights the important role an organization called the Navsarjan Trust in India is building a civil society in India by promoting the rights of the Dalit community. The report encourages AID to provide funding for the Trust, which is run by Martin Macwan, who received the Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights Award in 2000 for his work on behalf of the Dalit.

Founded in 1989, the Navsarjan Trust seeks to end discrimination against the Dalit. Since it was founded, it has become a highly respected force that focuses on five issues for the Dalit community: bringing about the land reforms promised fifty years ago in the Indian Constitution, improving the working conditions and wages of farm workers, abolishing scavenger labor, improving educational opportunities for children, and reducing violence. The Trust achieves its goals through non-violent protest and the judicial process. In eleven years, it has grown to 187 full-time organizers and has a presence in more than 2,000 villages. It is widely viewed as one of the most effective Dalit advocacy groups in India today, and it has filed a class action suit to abolish manual scavenging.

Although our assistance program in India is limited, the Navsarjan Trust would be an important ally and a useful way to help the Dalit community. Supporting the trust will demonstrate America's commitment to ending the discrimination faced by India's Dalits. I urge USAID to make funding available for the organization to advance its worthwhile objections.

I commend the subcommittee chairman, Senator LEAHY, and the other members of the Appropriations Committee for including these important provisions to reduce the discrimination faced by the Dalit community in India. Senator LEAHY is an effective champion of human rights throughout the world. I commend his leadership on this issue, and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in Congress to improve the lives of the Dalit community in India.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I am an enthusiastic supporter of robust American engagement with the world, and I believe current circumstances demand such a presence. We must also resolve to back our commitment with the financial resources to support the range of our interests overseas. For this reason, I am particularly disappointed by the long list of unrequested and unnecessary earmarks in the FY 2002 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, which total \$186.2 million. This figure represents \$30 million more than was contained in last

year's Foreign Operations bill for programs neither requested by the Administration nor authorized by Congress through the regular, merit-based process for allocating scarce resources.

It is the task of America's leaders to make the case for meaningful foreign operations funding in the face of public skepticism about the flow of American tax dollars overseas. It is incumbent upon those of us who serve in elective office to uphold the bipartisan tradition of enlightened American leadership around the world. In this era of globalization, international affairs touch the lives of average Americans in unprecedented ways. And as we wage a global campaign to purge from the world the terrorist threat against our very way of life, the assistance we provide to friendly governments and impoverished peoples across the globe supports our ability to sustain an international coalition to fight terror and retain the popular goodwill necessary to this task.

Unfortunately, the excessive and unwarranted earmarks in this bill do not inspire confidence that all our tax dollars are being spent in a manner most conducive to the advancement of our shared national concerns. Indeed, it may shock some Americans to know that parochial interests, not the national interest, have driven a disturbing proportion of the spending allocations contained in this bill.

Fragile allies suffering from civil unrest and economic decay will not be helped by this bill's provision of \$2.3 million in "core support" for the International Fertilizer Development Center, or the report language's recommendation of \$4 million for its work. Peanuts, orangutans, gorillas, neotropical raptors, tropical fish, and exotic plants also receive the committee's attention, although it's unclear why any individual making a list of critical international security, economic, and humanitarian concerns worth addressing would target these otherwise meritorious flora and fauna.

The committee has disturbingly singled out for funding a laundry list of American universities some with multi-billion dollar endowments in contravention of the usual merit-based process of allocating scarce foreign assistance dollars to the most worthy causes. Although disappointing, it is perhaps not surprising that there is a correlation between the geographic locations of many of the universities targeted for special treatment and the home states of those on the Appropriations Committee and members of the Senate leadership. Those left out of this correlation predicated on patronage rather than value to American national interests are, of course, the very people we would like to help overseas, and the programs of liberalization and reform we would otherwise use the money to encourage.

Given the unprecedented war we are in, we should be redoubling our efforts to target as many resources as possible

to win it. To this end, we should all heed the words of Office of Management and Budget Director Mitch Daniels, who said, "Everything ought to be held up to scrutiny. Situations like this can have a clarifying benefit. People who could not identify a low priority or lousy program before may now see the need."

America will go on, and we will continue to lead the world as only we can. The security and prosperity of our people demand it. Our wish to see our values flourish universally requires it. But we are handicapping ourselves in refusing, even in these times, to abandon the parochialism that infected congressional spending decisions long before our compelling international responsibilities provided us with a higher calling. Perhaps some of this parochial funding could be spent in a better way, helping more people and further advancing the virtuous causes we aspire to lead.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following documentation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

#### BILL LANGUAGE

#### TITLE II—BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

##### Development Assistance:

The International Fertilizer Development Center: provides \$2,300,000 for core support.

The United States Telecommunications Training Institute: provides \$500,000 for support.

The American Schools and Hospitals Abroad program: provides \$19,000,000.

#### REPORT LANGUAGE

#### TITLE II—BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

The Gorgas Memorial Institute Initiative for Tuberculosis Control: Committee recommends \$2,000,000.

Iodine Deficiency/Kiwanis: Committee recommends that AID provide at least \$2.5 million to Kiwanis International through UNICEF.

Helen Keller Worldwide, the International Eye Foundation, and others: Committee expects USAID to provide \$1.3 million.

Helen Keller Worldwide-initiated programs to aid the visually impaired in Vietnam and Cambodia: committee urges USAID to expand funding for similar programs.

Population Media Center: Committee supports.

International Medical Equipment Collaborative: urges AID to consider for funding.

Mobility International USA: recommends AID consider support for up to \$300,000.

Women's Campaign International: Committee recommends \$600,000.

Vital Voices Global Partnership: Committee recommends \$100,000.

American Schools and Hospitals Abroad: Committee has provided not less than \$19 million and expects USAID to allocate funds for Operating Expenses. The following are specified as deserving further support: Lebanese American University, International College, the Johns Hopkins University's Centers in Nanjing and Bologna, the Center for American Studies at Fudan University, Shanghai, the Hadassah Medical Organiza-

tion, the American University of Beirut, and the Feinberg Graduate School of the Weizmann Institute of Science.

Patrick J. Leahy War Victims Fund: Committee expects \$12 million be made available to support the fund's work.

United States Telecommunications Training Institute: Committee has provided not less than \$500,000.

International Executive Service Corps: Committee recommends \$5 million to support additional work by the IESC.

American University of Beirut: Committee urges AID to fund this program.

Sustainable Harvest International: Committee urges AID to provide \$100,000.

U.S./Israel Cooperative Development Program and Cooperative Development Research Program: Committee supports funding.

World Council of Credit Unions: Committee recommends up to \$2 million.

Protea Germplasm: requests AID to fund a joint South Africa-U.S. conference on sustaining the protea industries in South Africa and United States.

International Fertilizer Development Center: Committee recommends \$4 million for the core grant and research and development activities.

Biodiversity Programs: Committee expects AID to provide \$100 million to enhance biodiversity in marine environments.

Pacific International Center for High Technology Research: Committee recommends \$500,000 to initiate a demonstration program on sustainable renewable energy systems.

Tropical Fish and Plant Global Market: Committee urges funding by AID.

Parks in Peril: Committee continues strong support for the program.

Foundation for Security and Stability: Committee recommends \$2.5 million.

The Peregrine Fund: Committee recommends \$500,000 for the Neotropical Raptor Center.

Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International: Provides \$1.5 million to support the fund and the center.

Orangutan Foundation: Expects provision of \$1.5 million to support such organizations.

International Project WET: encourages AID to support the project's efforts.

Soils Management Collaborative Research Support Program: Recommends \$3 million for ongoing activities and initiate work on carbon storage.

Peanut Collaborative Research Support Program: Committee recommends that AID increase funding for this program.

University Programs: Committee recommends AID and/or the Department of State consider proposals for funding by the following organizations: Africa-America Institute, Alliance of Louisiana Universities, Atlanta-Tbilisi Partnership, City University, Columbia University, Connecticut State University System, Dakota Wesleyan University, Dartmouth Medical School, DePaul University College of Law—includes Arab-Israeli discussion on arms control and Inter-American Commission of Women and the Inter-American Children's Institute, EARTH University, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Florida International University, Green Mountain College, Iowa State University—includes International Women in Science and Engineering Program and support to the International Institute of Theoretical and Applied Physics, Historically Black Colleges, John Hopkins University, Kansas State University, La Roche College, Louisiana State University—includes LSU/Latin American Commercial Law project and International Emergency Training Center, Loyola University, Marquette University, Mississippi State University,

Montana State University Billings,—includes development of an online Master of Health Administration Degree Program and expanded programs in international business, St. Michael's College, St. Thomas University, South Dakota State University—includes International Arid Lands Consortium and food security in Central Asia, Temple University, Tufts University, University of Alaska, University of Arkansas Medical School, University of Dayton, University of Illinois—Chicago, University of Indianapolis, University of Iowa, University of Kentucky, University of Louisville—includes partnership with Rand Afrikaans University, program in Georgia, and collaborative research program on plant materials in Philippine rain forest, University of Miami, University of Mississippi, University of Nebraska Medical Center, University of New Orleans, University of Notre Dame, University of Northern Iowa—includes, Orava Project Global Health Corps program, and Russo-American Institute of Mutual Understanding, University of Rhode Island, University of San Francisco, University of South Alabama, University of Vermont, University of Vermont College of Medicine, Utah State University—includes establishment of a College of Agriculture of Jenin and World Irrigation Applied Research and Training Center, Vermont Law School, Yale University, and Western Kentucky University.

Bridge Fund in Tibet: Committee supports this project.

Joslin Diabetes Center: Committee encourages AID to support.

Galilee Society and Arava Institute for Environmental Studies: urges the Administration to consider funding.

School for International Training's Conflict Transformation Across Cultures Program: Committee believes funding is needed.

Care for Children International, Romania: encourages AID to support.

American Bar Association: Requests AID to consider providing \$500,000 to develop international database of ongoing legal reform efforts.

North Dakota-Turkmenistan Health Partnership and others: Committee supports.

Eurasian Medical Education Program of the American College of Physicians: Committee requests to be consulted on future funding.

Primary Health Care Initiative of the World Council of Hellenes: Recommends \$2 million.

United States-Ukraine Foundation: supports funding.

American Academy in Tbilisi: recommends an increased level of funding.

Georgia: Provides not less than \$3 million for a small business development project.

Total: \$186,200,000.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I am heartened by the amount of cooperation I have witnessed among my Senate colleagues and the expeditious way they have addressed our national security concerns in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11. The passage of the Airline Security and Anti-Terrorism bills will give the administration necessary tools to combat terrorism here at home. Whether the anthrax attacks of last week on our Nation's Capitol prove to be connected to Al Qaeda, it is certain that the attempt to bring our government to a standstill has failed. To be sure, the quarters here have been cramped but our commitment to work together has not been affected. Our thoughts and prayers go out to the families of the

postal workers who lost their lives this week, but this sad chapter only strengthens our resolve to find the culprits of these heinous acts and bring them to justice.

I commend the administration for its success in forming an international coalition on such short notice. The President's visit to Shanghai last week, and Secretary Powell's visit to India, were fruitful in getting us needed support from the two most populous countries in the world. I join the President in admonishing all nations who want to be a part of the civilized world to either side with us, or side with the terrorists. The time to be lukewarm is gone; we need to draw a line in the sand. I believe we are entering into a "New Cold War," where the stakes are no less grave than they were in the cold war of the twentieth century. The fight against radical Islam, like the fight against communism, is a fight to preserve the republican ideals that made our Nation so great. May we look to President Reagan and the example he set for American courage and American resolve to win in this "New Cold War".

Many of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee know that I am not a big fan of foreign aid, particularly when there are many vital projects that deserve attention here at home. The Foreign Operations Appropriations bill has many flaws, the worst of which has incited a Presidential veto threat due to provisions that would allow federal funding for international family planning organizations that perform abortions overseas. American taxpayer dollars should not be used to subsidize groups that do not respect the life of the unborn. This sends the wrong message to our children and cheapens the value of life. Other flaws include the onerous certification requirements that the administration must fulfill in order to assist in the rebuilding of vital infrastructure that we destroyed in Yugoslavia during the Kosovo war. Yugoslavia has made tremendous strides towards democracy, as can be witnessed by the free and fair elections that peacefully removed the Milosevic regime. Rather than further harm the Yugoslav people who are in need of such basic things as clean water, and heating for the coming winter months, we should allow the administration to grant assistance as it sees fit in this area.

I also have a problem with a bill that is over a half a billion dollars larger than last year, but is over \$160 million below the funding level requested by the administration for programs to curb illicit narcotics trafficking in the Andean region. How can we justify a spending increase of this magnitude at the expense of important programs that help to prevent the flow of illegal drugs into this country? Where is this increase in spending going?

Despite these flaws, however, the events over the past 6 weeks have understandably changed Americans' out-

look on international affairs, and our need to stay engaged. I recognize the responsibility the United States has in leading the fight to defend democracy and Western Civilization and, as such, the United States must remain involved in the international arena. This is not the time to isolate ourselves. The administration must have a complete arsenal at its disposal for the war against terrorism, and that includes having the ability to use foreign aid as a means to reward and reinvest in those nations who actively support us in this fight. Therefore, I will support the passage of this bill on condition that its most grave flaws be remedied in conference with the House. However, should the conference report be sent to the Senate floor "unremedied," I will be forced to consider opposing the report and urging my colleagues to do likewise.

Lastly, as a complement to the ongoing efforts to strengthen our national security, I urge the speedy passage of a revamped Intelligence Authorization bill that will give our intelligence community the capability it needs not to not only streamline the gathering and sharing of information among various agencies, but to have the discretion to act on that information as well. Our agents in the field should not be more worried about getting reprimanded for the methods they use in collecting information, than they should about ensuring the safety of our Nation.

I would also like to reiterate the importance to our national security of passing an energy bill that will allow us to explore other sources of energy domestically. As the prospects of a widened war in the Middle East becomes more likely, it is crucial that we take steps now to wean ourselves away from foreign sources of oil. We currently consume up to 700,000 barrels of oil a day from Iraq alone. If the American people are worried about the state of the economy now, just wait until we have a real energy crisis, and we will all see the economy go into a tailspin.

The eyes of the free world look to us for direction. We must not fail them.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the ranking member, Senator MCCONNELL, for his support and cooperation throughout this process. He has been a partner in writing the bill, in resolving the amendments, and I value his friendship and his advice.

I also commend the staff, for all their work. In particular, I recognize Paul Grove, who took over as the Republican clerk for the Foreign Operations Subcommittee earlier this year. Paul has quickly learned the appropriations process and has been a pleasure to work with.

In addition, Mark Lippert, the new deputy clerk on the Democratic side, has done an outstanding job.

Jennifer Chartrand, who has been a professional staff member for the Appropriations Committee for several years, provided essential advice and support to my staff. She was indispensable.

I thank Tara Magner of my Judiciary Committee staff, and J.P. Dowd, my legislative director, for their help during floor consideration of this bill.

I recognize Tim Rieser, the Democratic clerk for the subcommittee, for all his help.

And I thank Dakota Rudesill, staff member for the Budget Committee, who provided excellent and very helpful advice during floor consideration of this bill.

Finally, as always, we owe a debt to Billy Piper, on Senator McCONNELL's staff. Billy came in at crucial times to resolve a number of important issues.

That completes action on the Foreign Operations bill for fiscal year 2002.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I know of no other amendments.

I ask unanimous consent that with respect to H.R. 2506, the foreign operations appropriations bill, upon the disposition of all amendments, the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill; that upon passage, the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 2, as follows:

[Roll Call Vote No. 312 Leg.]

#### YEAS—96

Akaka	Bingaman	Campbell
Allard	Bond	Cantwell
Allen	Boxer	Carnahan
Baucus	Breaux	Carper
Bayh	Brownback	Chafee
Bennett	Bunning	Cleland
Biden	Burns	Clinton

Cochran	Hatch	Nelson (NE)
Collins	Helms	Nickles
Conrad	Hollings	Reed
Corzine	Hutchinson	Reid
Craig	Hutchison	Roberts
Crapo	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Daschle	Inouye	Santorum
Dayton	Jeffords	Sarbanes
DeWine	Johnson	Schumer
Dodd	Kennedy	Sessions
Domenici	Kerry	Shelby
Dorgan	Kohl	Smith (NH)
Durbin	Leahy	Smith (OR)
Edwards	Levin	Snowe
Ensign	Lieberman	Specter
Enzi	Lincoln	Stabenow
Feingold	Lott	Stevens
Feinstein	Lugar	Thomas
Fitzgerald	McCain	Thompson
Frist	McConnell	Thurmond
Gramm	Mikulski	Torricelli
Grassley	Miller	Voinovich
Gregg	Murkowski	Warner
Hagel	Murray	Wellstone
Harkin	Nelson (FL)	Wyden

#### NAYS—2

Byrd

Graham

#### NOT VOTING—2

Kyl

Landrieu

The bill (H.R. 2506) was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair appoints. Mr. LEAHY, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. BYRD, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. GREGG, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BOND, and Mr. STEVENS conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I want to take this opportunity to thank the staff of my good friend from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, with whom we have worked on this bill for these many years. They are Tim Rieser, Mark Lippert, and J.P. Dowd. I also extend my thanks to Jennifer Chartrand, Billy Piper of my personal staff, and Paul Grove, who replaced my long-time staffer, Robert Cleveland of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. He has done a superb job with his first bill. I thank them all from the bottom of my heart.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I compliment the distinguished chairman and ranking member for their excellent work. This is not an easy bill. Oftentimes, it is one that keeps us occupied for days, if not weeks. I thank them for their leadership, and I am very grateful for the fact that we were able to get this bill done.

Also, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, for

his work on the global AIDS matter. Were it not for him, we would not have had the additional resources that are so critical right now, this year, from this country. He did an outstanding job in that regard, too. While he is not on the floor at the moment, I thank him personally for all of his work.

As I announced earlier, it is our intention to take up the counterterrorism legislation. It has now passed in the House. We have had a good debate in the Senate. I would like to proceed with a unanimous consent request that would accommodate a good deal of debate again on a bill. I know there may be a colloquy involved. Let me proceed with the unanimous consent request, and I ask the cooperation of all Senators. I will propound the request now.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 3162

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent that at 10 o'clock Thursday, October 25, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3162, the counterterrorism bill; that no amendments or motions be in order to the bill, except a motion to table the motion to reconsider the vote on final passage of the bill; that there be 5 hours and 10 minutes for debate, with the time controlled as follows: 90 minutes each for the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, or their designees; 10 minutes each, controlled by Senators LEVIN and WELLSTONE; 20 minutes under the control of Senator SARBANES; 60 minutes under the control of Senator FEINGOLD; 15 minutes under the control of Senator GRAHAM of Florida; 15 minutes under the control of Senator SPECTER; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill be read the third time, the Senate then vote on final passage of the bill, with this action occurring with no further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for giving me this opportunity. He and I have discussed at length the concern that I have that is shared by Senator SMITH of Oregon. I want to take a minute or two to describe what is so important to us and have a discussion briefly with the distinguished majority leader.

In my home State of Oregon, we have not been able to do a covert investigation into dangerous criminal activity such as terrorism in more than a year. The hands of our prosecutors are tied. Senator Smith and I, along with a number of other colleagues and prosecutors, believe very strongly that it is critically important as part of this antiterrorism effort that we allow the prosecutors to go forward and do wiretaps, stings, and essentially undercover operations. We have not been able to get such a provision into this

antiterrorism legislation because of the work of the House.

Senator DASCHLE has been exceptionally supportive, as have Senator HATCH and Senator LEAHY. The Senate is united on this matter. The Senate has agreed in its entirety. For reasons that are inexplicable to this Member of the Senate, the House has been unwilling to untie the hands of Federal prosecutors in my home State.

The question then is: Why should every Senator care about what is happening in the State of Oregon? The reason I feel so strongly about this is that if we learned one thing on September 11, it is that if the terrorists get sanctuary anywhere, Americans are in trouble everywhere because we saw on September 11 the terrorists set up shop in New Jersey, they set up shop in Florida, and they ended up murdering Americans in New York City and in the Pentagon and in Pennsylvania.

As a result of the work that was done on the foreign operations appropriations legislation, again, to the credit of Senator DASCHLE, Senator LEAHY, and Senator SMITH, Senator LEAHY added the original bill that I authored. Senator SMITH and I have teamed up on this, and it is now in the foreign operations appropriations legislation that passed this body.

What is different tonight and why I am not objecting is that the White House has now indicated for the first time that they will support in the foreign operations appropriations legislation what Senator SMITH and I have crafted.

We have also been able to, in discussions with Senator DASCHLE, have an opportunity to let him discuss his views on it. He has renewed his commitment to me that we will have the united support of the Senate on the foreign operations appropriations bill, and if, in fact, the House junks this on the foreign operations appropriations bill in spite of the administration's effort, Senator DASCHLE, to his credit, has renewed his support for this effort and has been kind enough to give me this time to state my reservation.

I would like to have him briefly describe his views on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I say to both my colleagues from Oregon how much we appreciate their extraordinary efforts. I do not know of many pieces of legislation that pass unanimously not once but twice, and not only twice but within a matter of weeks. But that is the case.

This legislation passed unanimously as an amendment to the counterterrorism bill. This amendment has just now been passed unanimously as part of the foreign operations appropriations bill. That would not have happened were it not for their tenacity and their decisive leadership. I am grateful to them, first of all, for their willingness to continue to pursue this effort until they are successful.

I was involved in these discussions and negotiations with our colleagues from the House as we negotiated the various pieces. There were various reasons this legislation was not kept as part of the counterterrorism legislation, but I will tell my colleagues what I have said publicly: We will continue to pursue this; we will continue to persist until this becomes law.

As the Senator from Oregon has noted, the White House indicated they are prepared to join us in that effort. With that additional assistance, with those assurances, we are in a much stronger position now than we have been at any time in recent months to ensure our success. But if for whatever reason we are not successful, this will come back again and again, and we will continue to send it to the House again and again until it is done successfully.

I am confident we will complete our work successfully on this amendment. I am confident that with their partnership and the effort they have already made, we will be successful. I will pledge my support, and I know Senator LEAHY feels every bit as strongly as I do. We will work in concert with them to ensure the maximum level of success as we go into conference on the foreign operations appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I say to the majority leader, I will not object, but I want to be included in the colloquy and be entirely supportive of my colleague, Senator WYDEN. I want to state publicly for the record, Senator WYDEN and I began working on this issue together in great earnest this last weekend because it was apparent that the good bill we had passed to the House was coming back as something less than that bill.

Because of the unique circumstances described by Senator WYDEN, every American should know that the bill we are about to pass tomorrow puts a stake in Oregon that says Oregon is open for business to terrorism. That is a stake we want to pull out because right now no undercover work is going on in Oregon for a whole variety of unusual reasons. That is where it is, and that must be fixed, or every American should know that the bill we will pass tomorrow is an illusion until it includes all 50 States.

In my State, whether it is environmental terrorism, child pornography, drug runners, methamphetamine producers, or al-Qaida terrorist groups, they are finding aid and comfort from the absence of law enforcement when it comes to undercover activities. That must end or we are kidding the American people.

I thank the majority leader for his commitment. I thank Senator LOTT and the managers of this bill for their commitment, and I say for the record,

I have the assurances of Carl Rove with the White House, John Ashcroft in Justice, and I am awaiting a call from the Speaker of the House to work in earnest to get this resolved quickly so that we can in good faith face the American people and say: We have passed a terrorism bill that includes all Americans. But right now, it does not include Oregonians.

I yield to my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, if I may continue briefly on my reservation, Senator SMITH has summed it up very well. At this point in the State of Oregon, there are no wiretaps; there are no sting operations; you cannot infiltrate dangerous criminal groups no matter how dastardly their plans. We are not talking about some kind of abstract proposition.

The bill that is going to be passed tomorrow is essentially a bill that deals with terrorism in 49 States. As I say, it just seems to me once you allow a sanctuary, a launch pad for terrorist groups anywhere, everyone is at risk. What is different tonight is we have been able to secure a commitment from the White House.

The majority leader, as is his tradition, has worked very closely with me and has made a similar commitment to Senator Smith, and tonight—and I will say this is very hard for this Member of the Senate to do because I think the people of my home State are going to be at risk tonight—but because of the commitment we have secured from the majority leader—and it is a renewed commitment; again and again he has been in these meetings fighting to change the McDade law and give our prosecutors the tools to deal with this problem.

With the new commitment tonight from the White House and with the continued commitment and assurance of the majority leader tonight, I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I thank both of my colleagues from Oregon for their willingness to work with us. I have already said how strongly I feel about this matter, and the passion expressed by both Senators from Oregon I think is a clear indication of their determination to see this through to ultimate success. We will see success. I am grateful to them tonight.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2330

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of H.R. 3162, the Appropriations Committee be discharged from consideration of H.R. 2330, the Agriculture appropriations bill; that the Senate then proceed to its consideration; that immediately after the bill is reported, the majority manager, or his designee, be recognized to offer the

Senate-committee-reported bill as a substitute amendment; that the substitute amendment be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the amendment be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order be considered waived by this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I have had a number of questions asked today. It is my understanding we are going to try to complete the counterterrorism bill tomorrow and also go to the Agriculture appropriations bill tomorrow. Is that right?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from Nevada is correct. It is my hope once we have completed the counterterrorism bill, we could immediately begin debate on the Ag appropriations bill, and if it is possible to complete our work tomorrow night, it is my intention to have no votes on Friday.

Obviously, if we are unable to complete our work Thursday night, then there would have to be votes on Friday because we need to finish this bill. That would be the possibility, that if we complete our work, it would be my intention not to have votes on Friday. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, while the majority leader is in the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to proceed as in morning business for 5 minutes and have his attention for the first 60 seconds of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I rise today to clarify a matter that has been somewhat taken out of context. I know my good friend, the majority leader, was asked this morning about comments the Senator from Delaware allegedly made speaking to the New York Council on Foreign Relations, which surprised me the question was asked.

I was informed that a high-ranking Republican on the House side put out a statement—and I am sure he did not understand the context—suggesting I implied Americans were high-tech bullies who were bombing Afghans, and we should be fighting on the ground and not bombing.

I want to assure my friend from South Dakota, in his response to the question, he was correct. I did not say anything like that. I will read from the transcript from the New York Council on Foreign Relations speech.

I was asked by a gentleman, whose name I will not put in the—well, his name is Ron Paul, whom I do not know, who says: I concur with everybody else in commending you on your comments, and he goes on.

Then he says: With regard to the bombing, every day it goes on the harder it may be for us to do something next, referring to rebuilding Afghanistan. He said: What do you see as the situation if we do not defeat the Taliban in the next 4 weeks and winter sets in in Afghanistan?

The context of the question was, Is it not a hard decision for the President to have to choose between bombing, knowing it will be unfairly used for propaganda purposes by radical Muslims in that area of the world, and bombing to make the environment more hospitable for American forces to be able to be successful on the ground?

I said it was a hard decision. The question was repeated, and my answer was: I am not a military man—I will read this in part.

The part that I think flies in the face of and plays into every stereotypical criticism of us—

Referring to the radical Muslims, that part of the world that is radical—

is we're this high-tech bully that thinks from the air we can do whatever we want to do, and it builds the case for those who want to make the case against us that all we're doing is indiscriminately bombing innocents, which is not the truth.

So I want the majority leader to know, and I am sure when the gentleman on the House side sees the comments, he will be able to put it in the proper perspective because the irony is anyone who has been in the Senate knows I was the first, most consistent, and the last calling for the United States to bomb in Bosnia, bomb in Kosovo, use the full force of our air power.

I have been around long enough to know unless someone stands up and clarifies something, it can get out of hand very quickly.

I thank my colleague for his response this morning to the press and for his faith in his chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I assure him, in this case at least, it was well placed.

I ask unanimous consent that my entire speech—which I would not ordinarily do because it is my own speech—to the Council on Foreign Relations be printed in the RECORD, along with the question and answers that follow.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Remarks By Joseph R. Biden, Jr., United States Senator—Delaware]

FROM TRAGEDY TO OPPORTUNITY: ACTING WISELY IN A TIME OF UNCERTAINTY

(Council on Foreign Relations, New York City, October 22, 2001, (As Prepared))

When I accepted this invitation I expected to be talking about the ABM treaty, about our military priorities in the context of an evaporating budget surplus, or about missile defense versus the more urgent threats we could face—and now, in fact, do face.

I thought the questions I might be asked would be about strategic doctrine, about relations with traditional adversaries like Russia and China, and whether the Yankees will win another World Series.

I certainly did not, for one instance, think we'd be here today wondering about our short-and long-term goals in a war against terrorism: Will we succeed? How long will it take? What constitutes victory?

But those are, in fact, the questions facing the United States, and, I confess, they're not easy to answer.

First, our immediate goal is to cut off the head of Al Qaeda, break up the network, leave them no safe haven. That means the removal of Osama bin Laden, Mullah Omar, and the Taliban leadership.

I don't know how long it will be before the regime is toppled. I wouldn't want to guess. But the handwriting is on the wall. They've lost the support of their key sponsors and are essentially isolated. But some of these sponsors may need reminding that they've got to make a clear break with the past, and we should not hesitate to spell that out.

After Al Qaeda and the Taliban fall, and—to use the phrase of the day—we drain the swamp, the medium-term goal is to roll up all Al Qaeda cells around the world.

Then, with the help of other nations and possibly with the ultimate sanction of the United Nations, our hope is we'll see a relatively stable government in Afghanistan—one that does not harbor terrorists, is acceptable to the major players in the region, represents the ethnic make up of the country, and provides a foundation for future reconstruction.

In the long term, our goals are easy to articulate, but much more difficult to achieve.

We'll need to deter any potential state sponsors of terrorism from providing support or haven to future bin Ladens.

We'll work with others and try to help rebuild a politically and socially stable Afghanistan that does NOT export terrorism, narcotics, or militancy to its neighbors and to the wider world—more like it was in the 1950s.

We'll need to stabilize Southwest and Central Asia and prevent the Taliban-izing, if you will, of Pakistan and other countries.

And we'll need to address some of the economic and political forces that can be manipulated by men like bin Laden. We must do this with the full awareness that attention to social and political development alone won't prevent another bin Laden from emerging. But, at least, it will severely limit the pool from which he can draw recruits and support.

If we're successful in prosecuting this effort in Afghanistan, it ups the ante for other nations harboring or sponsoring—directly or indirectly—other terrorist groups.

The President believes, and I agree, that we must stay involved in the region, not necessarily with American troops, but with American leadership, and resources.

The President has repeated many times, and it's important that we say it over and over again: This is not a war against the Afghan people or any one faith. This is a war between nation states and transnational terrorist organizations, between civilization and chaos.

We need to remind the world's 1.2 billion Muslims—the vast majority of whom are sickened by the attempted hijacking of their faith—that our beef is with bin Laden and Al Qaeda, not with them.

American policy has long been marked by a blend of the Wilsonian trend and realpolitik, but whatever our motive, it has not been guided by religious imperatives.

When we sought to bring peace and stability to the Balkans, the Muslims in Bosnia and Kosovo were the primary beneficiaries.

When we went into Somalia, our aim was to feed starving people who happen to be Muslims.

And, when we provided 170 million dollars in humanitarian assistance to the Afghan

people in the last year, it had to do with our principles, and the people there were Muslim, too.

Unfortunately, we're doing a terrible job of disseminating information. We have to take a fresh look at public diplomacy and determine the most effective ways we can get out our message.

But I'm under no illusions. Winning the hearts and minds of ordinary citizens in the Islamic world is an uphill battle, but one we must undertake.

We must enhance the means we use as well as the message—whether it's people to people visits that explain our principled respect for the diversity of all faiths and cultures—or radio and television broadcasts that inform and ultimately empower moderate Muslim voices.

What we cannot do is let the Taliban wage the same propaganda war Saddam waged in Iraq, with photographs of mothers and children scrambling for food and endless footage of destroyed buildings—all designed to portray America as anti-Islam. That's a bald-faced lie.

Regardless of whether we succeed in getting our message out, the truth is, we CAN—NOT and we certainly WILL not walk away from seven million displaced and desperate Afghans surviving on little more than grass and locusts.

We must do more to help the Afghan people, and we must do FAR more to make our aid visible across the Muslim world.

I'm reluctant to use the word "nation building" because it's such a loaded political term—but, if we leave Afghanistan in chaos, it'll be another time bomb waiting to explode. And there's an enormous powder keg right next door in Pakistan.

If we think we have a problem now, imagine a nation with six times the population of Afghanistan, a nuclear arsenal, and a Talibanized government.

To avoid that scenario, we have to work with the World Bank, the IMF, the U.N., other NGOs and our allies, especially those in the region, to help build an infrastructure in Afghanistan that works.

United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan said it will take nearly \$600 million just to get the Afghan refugees through the winter. But that's only the beginning.

In the long term, Afghanistan will need to find a way to break the hold that the madrassas have had on a generation of young men.

They will need to educate a generation of young women, to give them the tools necessary to seize the rights so cruelly denied them under Taliban rule.

They'll need to de-mine the most heavily mined nation in the world.

They'll need crop substitution programs to rid themselves of the title of the world's foremost producers of heroin and opium.

They'll need wells, water purification centers, hospitals, village clinics, even simple roads from one town to the next.

I commend the President for promising \$320 million in Afghan aid. In my opinion, this might be the best investment we could make. I say this notwithstanding the many obstacles to achieving these goals that exist in a region that has not proved fertile for incubating democratic institutions. Clearly, we can't do it alone.

As demonstrated since September 11th, it's even more obvious, at least to me, that our national interests can't be furthered, let alone achieved—in splendid indifference to the rest of the world.

Our interests are furthered when we meet our international obligations, keep our treaties, and engage the world.

Far from the black and white of campaigns and up against the gray of governing, it's

much easier to see the virtues of multi-nationalism and the shortcomings of unilateralism.

The same tools we used to build this coalition may, in the long term, help change the dynamics of bilateral relations, and present real and unexpected opportunities to define this new century.

And by the way, the Administration has figured it out.

Where the Administration may have once been tempted to see only strategic differences with China over national missile defense and Taiwan, today there's a growing recognition that we have common strategic interests as well—like fighting terrorism and maintaining peace and stability in Central Asia.

Where the Administration may have once seen relations with Russia through the prism of the Cold-War, today there's the promise of entering into a fundamentally different relationship with the Russian Federation.

Where the Administration may have once viewed relations with Iran within the confines of a twenty-year time warp, today Iran has signaled a desire to at least explore a relationship based on newly defined common interests. They've even said they would assist in search and rescue operations of any downed American pilots.

Clearly there's an internal rift in Iran. The reformists would like to go further. All they could get through the system was this modest gesture. But because the system operates on consensus, I'm virtually certain Khamene'i approves, which is significant in itself.

Let's not be under any illusion that there will be full blown rapprochement with China, Russia, and Iran. But if we do this right, if we look at our adversaries in a new light, there will be much to build off in the future.

This weekend the President was in Shanghai for the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Summit. He met with China's leaders, who now see more clearly than ever the threat posed to them by the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, biological, and ballistic missile technology.

I guarantee that Jiang Zemin can imagine a plane crashing into an 80 story office tower in Shanghai. I expect that China's leaders will never think of their nuclear and ballistic missile exports to Pakistan in quite the same way.

Working with China against terrorism, however, does not mean jettisoning our concerns about China's human rights record, or overlooking proliferation. In fact, we may need to remind China's leaders that respect for the human rights and religious liberty of China's Muslim minorities is not only morally right, but also essential if we are to deprive the terrorists of recruits.

In Russia, President Putin has emerged as a strategic thinker who realizes that, in order for Russia to advance into the ranks of highly developed nations, he must cast his lot with the West.

Putin recently said "Today we must firmly declare: the Cold War is over." And with respect to our efforts in Afghanistan, he said "I have no doubt that the U.S. leadership and President Bush will do their best so that the peaceful population does not suffer, and they are already doing their best."

Putin is willing to confront entrenched, reactionary domestic opposition when necessary. He overruled his senior military, and gave the green light for American planes to overfly Russian territory and to permit troops on former Soviet territory in Central Asia, actions virtually unimaginable not long ago.

We have a genuine opportunity to pursue a new relationship with Russia, and we should. If the news out of Shanghai this weekend is

accurate, it may well be possible to reach agreement on mutually limiting offensive capabilities and allowing Tests of missile defense systems. I hope the President will resist those in his Administration who would have him risk squandering this opportunity by withdrawing unilaterally from the ABM treaty.

I've always said: nations, like people, use crises to resolve differences, or create opportunities.

In the case of Russia, we have a momentous opportunity. It may well be possible to deal not only with strategic forces, but also with NATO enlargement and our non-proliferation concerns.

That new relationship could shape this half-century as the Cold-War shaped the last.

Three days ago, Secretary Powell said in Shanghai, "Not only is the Cold War over, the post-Cold War period is also over."

If the Administration proceeds pragmatically, rather than ideologically, the new era could be good, indeed.

But let's remember that Russia is not the only country that matters in developing a new strategic doctrine. We must take care not to provoke a major Chinese arms buildup, which could lead to more nuclear arms in India and Pakistan. We need the help of both in the war on terrorism. And nobody needs more nuclear weapons along a border that is already getting too hot for comfort.

The time is right to consider joint efforts to reduce strategic arms; commit to a joint program to combat terrorism; develop a bilateral plan to prevent other countries or terrorists from gaining weapons of mass destruction; find ways to counter infectious disease epidemics and clean up the residue left by our weapons programs. And we should do everything we can to help Russia stay on a path of economic and political growth and stability.

Once the foundation of cooperation is firmly established, we can pursue missile defense—if that's what we want—without rocking the boat of strategic stability.

Look, in the long-term—even if the coalition breaks down—we'll have the potential opportunity to create a new day of enhanced bilateral relations with China, Russia, and maybe even with Iran.

So, in the short term we want to eliminate bin Laden and his top aides and remove Mullah Omar and the Taliban leadership.

In the medium term, we'll need to establish a relatively stable regime in Afghanistan and roll up Al Qaeda cells around the world.

And in the long-term, we have to deter state sponsorship of future bin Ladens, help rebuild Afghanistan, and stabilize Southwest and Central Asia.

What will be much more difficult, will be to clearly identify and address some of the root causes of this hard-core, hate-driven zealotry so we can limit the pool from which another bin Laden can draw recruits.

The list of root causes is long—from the lack of legitimate channels of dissent in the Arab world, to desperation, resentment at American material success, a perception that our actions don't match our ideals.

All of these issues are worthy of our attention, but they can never be excuses for terrorism.

Which brings us to Israel. Let me just say, Israel did not produce bin Laden, and we can't let Israel be the scapegoat.

We are in a tough stage right now, and there are many cross-winds buffeting our relationship, but our friendship with Israel is not a transitory event, a marriage of convenience, or a short-term alliance.

Differences are normal even among friends, but airing them in public is never useful. Surely there are sufficient channels to communicate our views. Let us not create any

false impressions about the fundamental, long-term basis upon which the U.S.-Israel relationship rests: we continue to be bound by unshakable, shared democratic values.

After all this, the question remains—what constitutes victory in the war on terrorism?

If we cut off the head of Al Qaeda, help to rebuild a stable Afghanistan, and if, in the process, we find a way to stabilize the relationship between Pakistan and India, and enhance bilateral relations with China, Russia, and Iran, then we have achieved a victory that may well define the 21st century.

In sum, just as we could not have put together a viable coalition if President Bush had already walked away from the ABM Treaty, so too will we have trouble nurturing future bilateral relations if we decide, when the crisis is over, to go it alone, again.

We should be figuring out right now how we revive the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), the Biological Weapons Treaty, move on arms control proposals that go to Start III, environmental treaties, and how to amend—and not jettison—the ABM Treaty.

Before I take some questions let me leave you with these final thoughts. On September 11th the world changed for the terrorists. It was, I believe the beginning of the end of a way of life, not for America, but for international terrorism.

Out of our dark grief our nation is newly united and abroad we have new opportunities.

As my mother says, “Out of every tragedy, if you look hard enough, you can find one good thing.”

Or, in the words of another great Irish poet, Seamus Heaney:

“History says, don’t hope  
On this side of the grave.  
But then, once in a lifetime  
The longed-for tidal wave  
Of justice can rise up,  
And hope and history rhyme.”

I truly believe, notwithstanding incredible difficulties we face in doing even half the things I mentioned here, that we’re on the verge, if we do it right, of making hope and history rhyme. But we cannot squander this opportunity. I believe the President has made a genuine transition in his thinking on foreign policy. I hope I am not kidding myself. If he has, I think not only will he go down as a great President, I think we will have marked the beginning of a new era in international relations.

The following transcript of the Question and Answer period has been provided by the Council on Foreign Relations. The moderator is former Congressman Vin Weber.

VW: Thank you. It’s my job to screen questions for the Senator without trying to get too much between the questioner and the answer. Under the rules of these engagements, when I call on you will you please stand up and state your affiliation, and try to state your question as concisely as possible. To get things going, though, I’m going to take the prerogative of the Chair and ask the first question.

Senator, you talked at some length about some possibilities in terms of relationships around Russia and other places. Talk about a place where there might be some strains, the American people at least are being fed a significant diet of negative information about our relationship with the Saudis and their relationship to terrorism over these past many years. Is there a deeper problem there than we thought, and how should the American people and the government think about that relationship?

JB: I’ve been admonished to make the answers very, very brief, so I will make them brief, if you want me to expand I will at-

tempt to do that. Number one, I do not doubt the pressure that the Saudis are under, like other Arab states in the region, having to essentially buy off their extreme groups in order to maintain themselves. But the Saudis have gone above and beyond the call in destabilizing the region, in my view, in terms of essentially funding a significant portion of what we are now dealing with in the extreme example of Islam gone awry. It’s one thing to decide you’re going to export Wahhabi Sunnism, by setting up Madrassas around the region. Okay, I get that. But what I don’t get is setting them up where they have a third feature: that they’re a hate-filled, anti-American breeding ground.

I think we should have a very simple, straightforward discussion with the Saudis and they should understand that they have a hell of a lot more to lose in the break up of the relationship than we do. That is taking a great risk. I am not sanguine about the fact that we get 1.6 million barrels of oil a day from there, but I would be prepared, were I the Secretary of State, or I was in another position, to tell the Saudis: Don’t push it. Don’t push it. Cease and desist on this activity. There will be consequences. At any rate, that’s my view.

SR: I’m Steve Robert of Robert Capital Management. As I listened carefully to your address, which I thought was very good, it seems the center of gravity in the debate over missile defense has changed. Because while the opponents of missile defense prior to September 11th would have just probably said it’s a foolish idea and the wrong priority, what you seem to be saying is that, it’s almost inevitable if we also cut nuclear arms stockpiles, renegotiate the arms control treaty and the strategic arms treaty and so forth. So is this in fact what you mean to communicate, that we’re now just talking about how we get to missile defense, as opposed to whether we should have missile defense at all?

JB: What I’m suggesting is, and it’s a very good question, what I’m suggesting is, we should be prepared to explore, assuming we can amend the ABM Treaty to do the exploration, whether or not a viable missile defense system is feasible without starting a new arms race, and without producing an economic hemorrhage of a half a trillion dollars with little return on our investment.

Right now we’re caught between the rock and the hard place. In order to go forward, according to this administration—and I think they’re inaccurate—but the gentleman sitting behind you has forgotten more about this issue than I am going to know. But in order for them to go forward with the testing program they have in mind, they can do it without having to violate the ABM Treaty. But it has become sort of religious doctrine on the right that the ABM Treaty is, per se, bad. I’m hopeful that we’re at a place now, where the President, if we in fact—and I happen to support significant further reductions in all offensive capability—if we get the Joint chiefs to agree upon a number significantly below where we are, I’m willing to go along with an amendment of the ABM Treaty, assuming that we have scrubbed this in a way that we understand what the likely response in China will be to such a system.

If in fact, notwithstanding the fact that the Russians would agree, this will start a significant—and our intelligence agencies publish widely, and I can only tell you what was in the paper, only confirm . . . I won’t confirm, I’ll state what’s in the paper—that they will do ten times as much as they would have otherwise done in offensive capability if we build such a system. If we cannot get through that wicket, then it seems to me it is not worth a candle. The cost is not worth it, and the consequence of going forward

with the limited benefit that would flow from it may very well start that arms race which I worry most about in the most dangerous part of the world. It was dangerous before, and it’s considerably more dangerous now.

So I cannot fathom India sitting by if China rapidly racks up their nuclear capability, and I cannot figure Pakistan doing the same, and so I see it as a disaster. But this is a beginning step, and I guess the polite way of saying this, I’m happy the President seems to be moving in the direction where he may not unilaterally walk away from the ABM Treaty. That’s a big deal.

VW: I want to go to Rita next, but if there are other questions on either strategic defense or the ABM Treaty, I’ll take them now, before we leave that topic. If not, we’ll go to Rita.

RH: Rita Hauser. You didn’t mention Iraq. Do you see Iraq in the second stage as a target for the terrorists counter-offensive, and what is your view on the continuation of our policy of sanctions?

JB: I happen to think that the sanctions policy needs to be changed. The Secretary of State has discussed a smarter sanctions policy. I thought he was going in the right direction, I was hoping that it would be embraced, although I now think there’s an opportunity to embrace it because the dynamics have changed in Moscow, and the dynamics have changed in France, and the dynamics have changed in China somewhat, and I would further explore going back to that approach, that is, a smart sanctions policy.

I’m of a view that what has changed has all been bad from a Iraq standpoint, for the Iraqis. The idea now that we are going to just disregard what Saddam has done, walk away and just seek economic opportunity, as some of our friends and allies have done, I think is being reconsidered in those very capitols. Rather than have a second phase, the way in which the press uses it, and I assume you’re talking about, that is, after we finish with Afghanistan, do we invade Iraq? I think that is not the prudent approach. I think what we attempt to do is to build a coalition, reconstruct a coalition that is tighter and stronger and with more demands placed upon the behavior of Iraq.

My view is, if we’re able to do that, and the behavior is still as bad as it has been in the past, you will be able to much more likely generate a consensus on at least standing by as we took action, or having multilateral action. But to just go from here to there I think would be a disastrous mistaken in the near term.

VW: Go back to that table. I’m going to try to move the audience as best I can.

FW: Frank Wisner from the American International Group. The current crisis . . . (Overlap)

JB: Why are you taking folks out of Delaware? We want to talk about that . . . (Laughter) . . . I want to know this, Mr. Ambassador, this a parochial, this a serious stuff. (Laughter) I’m only joking . . . (Overlap)

FW: . . . we have commitment . . . (Overlap)

JB: . . . I just want to kind of throw you off. (Laughter)

VW: . . . He’s not really joking. (Laughter)

JB: . . . Former Congressman, I can tell you, I’m worried about it, but . . .

FW: Senator, coming back to the subject of your terrific speech today, (Laughter) . . .

JB: It went from good to terrific. (Laughter)

FW: This crisis has brought to light other tensions, and among them has been the sparking of tension between India and Pakistan, with very heavy Indian shelling, acts of

terror in Kashmir. As you look at that aspect of the challenge to American diplomacy, what message do you have to the parties in the region, how they can get on top of the problem they have and the role the United States can play?

JB: Let me answer it in reverse order. The role of the United States. The United States should stay engaged the way the Secretary has gotten engaged in the last week. It's made a difference already. I think there has to be a clear understanding, both in Delhi and Islamabad that we are interested, we are looking and we are watching.

Secondly, I think a message should be delivered very strongly to the Indians, do not attempt to take advantage of the circumstances this moment, it's against your interests across the board. And thirdly, we have to make clear to the Pakistanis that, notwithstanding the fact we need you very much right now, you are in a position where if you are going to continue to foment the terror that does exist in Kashmir, then you are operating against your own near term interests, because that very viper can turn on you. And I think we have to talk and talk and talk and talk, and engage and engage and engage. Because as you well know, part of the cry on the part of India has been, just somebody pay attention . . . or excuse me, in Pakistan, someone pay attention.

And on India, we don't want any part of anybody being involved and looking at any of this problem. The truth of the matter is, the whole world is looking at their problem now in Kashmir, not just us, the spotlight is on and the consequences for how they will be treated relative to all other nations in the world is very much up in the air right now, and they should be made constantly aware of how tenuous the circumstance is for both of them. In this case, particularly India . . . in my view, particularly India.

VW: Can I follow up on that myself? Because at the beginning of this administration, the administration seemed to be tilting, to use a term, toward India, the Indian Foreign Minister was given a meeting with the President, and it seemed as if the administration was going to try to, as one of the cornerstones of their foreign policy, build a much better relationship with India than we've had in the past. In view of what you just said, do you think that that was then, and this is now, or is there still an opportunity going forward to forge a much closer relationship with the Indians?

JB: I think that was then, and it's almost still that way now. (Scattered Laughter) And let me explain what I mean by that. I may be mistaken, and I may be a bit cynical, but I think the initial, quote, tilt toward India was related to Beijing more than it was to Pakistan or anything else. And I think that the relationship with Beijing was going south very rapidly. And continued to move south in a precipitous way until Powell made his visit.

I coincidentally happened to take a small delegation of Senators to some very high level meetings for six days in China, just on the heels of that visit, and you could literally see, maybe a mild exaggeration, a sigh of relief on the part of the Chinese, that maybe this collision is not inevitable, it is not inevitable. I think it chastened the Chinese a little bit, I think it made them focus on the precipice, as well as us.

Now what's happened is, I think, you have, and it's a . . . I cannot prove this, I think what you have in India now is a look north and saying, whoa, it looks like these guys are talking again. We may have moved past our opportunity to make a substantial change in the relationship. That would be a mistake on their part, to think that. Because I think that there is a desire in the ad-

ministration to actually, genuinely better relations with India. I think it is an absolute essential element of American foreign policy that that be done. And part of that is simply engaging . . . engaging them and treating them like what they are. They will, in not too long, be the largest, most populous nation in the world. They are a democracy, as flawed as you may think it is. They are someone with whom we should and must have a much, much, much better relationship and understanding.

And the whole world has changed for India. It has changed not only when the Wall came down, and when their protector evaporated, it changed now as the relationship with China begins to mature, and they're going to have some great difficulty internally figuring out how to deal with that. But we should be engaged at the highest level on a daily basis, literally with India. So I don't think the administration is jettisoning India, but I think they're beginning to look at India in a different way, not as cynically as just a card to have been played against Beijing.

VW: Questioner behind Frank, then I'm going to try to go the back of the room for a question.

ME: Monsoor Ejaz. Senator, it's always good to hear you speak so frankly, so I'm going to try and get you on the record on another sensitive issue. Does the United States need a military policy to deal with an eventuality in which a Taliban-like force would hold control over Pakistan's nuclear weapons? And if it does, what should that policy look like?

JB: Well, I think we're engaged in that policy right now. And I have every reason to believe from my conversations with the President, and I don't pretend to be his confidant, I don't want anyone . . . I know you all know that, but the CNN audience might think I'm trying to foist myself off as the President's close advisor. I've been flattered the President has engaged me as the opposition and as Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and we've had, as they say, full and frank discussion, probably five, six hours worth in the last several months, and . . . but my impression and my understanding is, coming from both the Secretary of State as well as the Secretary of Defense and as well as the President of the United States personally, that that is the essence of their policy at the moment.

It is reflected in certain ways. You see, and I'll be very parochial, and I'm going to give you a specific example. Right now there has been, and continues to exist, a real dissatisfaction on the part of the Northern Alliance that we have not done, which is fully without our capability to do now, and that is with air power, essentially provide air cover that could decimate the Taliban capability of holding them back, not only from Mazar i Sharif, but also holding them back from the capitol.

And the President has not been as blunt as I'm going to be, because I don't speak for him, so I can say it, I believe the President's actions have been somewhat circumspect for very good reasons. He understands that if in fact the Northern Alliance marches into Kabul and sets up a government, that we will have the potential for a disintegration in Islamabad, and that Pakistan may very well, and Musharraf may in fact collapse, it may be gone.

And so I think that . . . I'll give you that as one example of my view of the President's understanding of how difficult this is. We have also done things which were not particularly comfortable for me to do, quite frankly. I'm the guy, as Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that was responsible for either facilitating and/or pro-

posing the lifting of all the sanctions, of which I have supported relative proliferation, not to proliferation questions, as well as democratization. And we've even looked at Section 508, and so my point is that we have taken extraordinary actions, which is sort of against our instincts, with only the promise, only the promise of elections a year from now, with the commitment to be kept, and only the hope, the hope that we will be able to stabilize, that the region will, with our help and others, be stabilized in such a way that we don't have to face that God awful specter of radical Islamic groups taking over a country that is multiple sizes larger than Afghanistan, with nuclear weapons.

So I think the administration is fully appraised, fully understands, and is doing everything within its power, understanding, and I don't . . . in defense of the administration, no one has a hole card here. No one that I know, maybe some of you do, and if you do, let me know because I want to nominate you for the Nobel Peace Prize in advance. No one I know has a surefire way to assure that stability in this part of the world will result from the actions undertaken. Conversely, I don't know of anyone who . . . I do know of some, I don't know anyone in this room would like to suggest we should not and need not have taken the action we are taking. We're not going to get into the weeds here. It's going to start to get . . . we talked, and I hope I don't offend anybody saying this, at our table here, we talked about how long the honeymoon, how long the unquestioning period of unabashed support for the President's policy will continue. I think everyone . . . I shouldn't say everyone . . . I mean the vast majority of the foreign policy establishment, of the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle, in fact share the view that up to now the President's done a pretty darn good job of assembling this multilateral force, resisting what were very strong entree's from parts of the administration to bypass Afghanistan and go straight to Iraq, et cetera. I think he's done well. But now we're going to get into the tough calls.

Case in point, and I'll stop with this. How much longer does the bombing continue? Because we're going to pay every single hour, every single day it continues, we're going to pay an escalating price in the Muslim world. We're going to pay an escalating price in the region. And that in fact is going to make the aftermath of our, quote, victory more difficult to reconstruct the region. Conversely, the President's in a very difficult spot. How much does he have to do to make the environment in which we are going to send, and we will, American forces, hospitable to the extent . . .

*(Council on Foreign Relations tape turned to side B . . . several seconds missing . . .)*

. . . tell you, though, I hope to God it ends sooner rather than later, because every moment it goes on, it makes the aftermath problem more severe than it is . . . was an hour ago. And so that's what I mean when I say they're fully appraised of their problem. They are going to engage in activities that we may . . . I may be able to Monday morning quarterback and second guess, but I know of no clear path that suggests how they secure the notion that there is no possibility of Pakistan degenerating into chaos, and us dealing with a problem there. The ultimate answer would be, if that were the case, we would find ourselves with a whole hell of a lot more forces in that region than we have now, which would be a very bad idea.

VW: Going to go right straight to the back of the room, and then I have a question at the middle table up front.

DG: I'm Davey Gaw(?), with the conference board. Senator, you gave us a picture that was historic, and it raised the question in my mind, to this effect. Is there an advertising problem, is there a genuine insoluble intellectual issue, or simply have we not solved the following? It seems to me that for the past 50 years or so, the U.S. has always been stuck in a corner, on the one hand we launch into the world with noble causes, and then we tie ourselves to ignoble regimes so that we have (*Inaudible*) for purposes, but people think that we're married to these regimes, and the same thing is occurring now in the Middle East. What's wrong? Why can't we do a dual track strategy? Why can't we send a message that's credible, that we do serve double purposes on the one end, but we also do not want to marry ignoble regimes on the other? Why can't we solve that issue?

JB: Because life's tough (*Scattered Laughter*) There are hard choices. I don't know. I don't want to get him in trouble, but I suspect Les Gelb may remember, about a dozen years ago, my proposing we start to distance ourselves from some of those various regimes, and for example, during the Gulf War, one of the reasons I voted against the resolution that was put forward was, I did not get any commitment from the administration personally that they would in fact make sure that when we freed Kuwait, the circumstance in Kuwait would change. I did not see merely putting the Emir back in power as anything that inured to our great benefit. The territorial principle of not crossing a border was a big deal, and important and oil mattered, but it seemed to me we should have extracted in return for that some commitment toward the movement toward, some movement toward, not outright democracy, but some movement toward a liberalization of the system.

I have been the odd man out on that for a long time with regard to Saudi Arabia as well, and other countries in the region. But I acknowledge to you, it is incredibly difficult to do. And you got to be prepared to take a risk, and the risk is serious. The down side is high. The costs economically are severe. But I think we're at the point now where we have to take those risks. But it's not easy. It is not easy because the truth of the matter is, we inherited what was there, we helped make and sustained what was there, but we did it for reasons relating to our immediate self interests that were of consequence to us, enabling us to do other things in other parts of the world that were necessary to be done.

So, it's, yes, as a former President once said, life ain't fair. Well, the world ain't fair, and we're left with a lot of Hobson's Choices. If I can elaborate on one piece. This dissemination of information, I put together a proposal that I've been discussing with the administration. I've been sort of the guy who has, and a lot of you have as well, but I mean in the Senate, in the House, I've been sort of the godfather of the radios lately, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, the Voice of America, et cetera. It's woefully underfunded. For example, in the largest Muslim state in the world, where they have 220 million people, we spend two million dollars on the radio, for example. So I put together a proposal at the President's urging, quite frankly, because one of the things I discussed with him, that I'm going to present to him when he gets back, is over a half a billion dollar initial investment, 250 million dollars a year, for public diplomacy, and fundamentally altering the way in which we're able to broadcast to that part of the world. As part of this, I asked my staff, and I have some very talented staff people who know the region well, have worked in the region, and are very academically qualified as well as prac-

tically qualified, if they would get together some two or three or four of the most knowledgeable folks on Islam in the world, so that we in fact, when I propose this, I was doing something that was counterproductive. So that we wouldn't find we were causing more problems than there were solutions. And I sat with these four folks, I'll tell you what they said to me. Now, they're not the end of the day, but they said to me, they said, look, the idea of winning the hearts and minds of the Islamic world, and the Arab Islamic world is not likely. The best you can do is give some reasons for the moderates within that regime to have a reason to sustain their position against the extremists in . . . did I say regime? I meant to say region, against extremists in the region. And they went on to say, the problem isn't with the American people, it's with American foreign policies, and then they ticked off the foreign policy. Being part of propping up regimes that in fact are anti-democratic and are part of the problem, because again, Osama Bin Laden is after Riyadh, not after Jerusalem.

And it's a different problem. And also they then point out Israel, and they say part of the problem relates to our policy relative to Israel. Well, there are certain things we're not going to change. There are certain things we're not going to change, so the question is, what utility would a significant investment in our public diplomacy have? And it seems to me the minimum what it would have, it would give a context in which we were able to . . . they were able to make judgments about the totality of our action, and would not in fact change the attitude in that part of the world toward us, but would moderate it. And so these are very difficult questions, though, but I am going to propose we make this major investment, and I think it will fall on, quite frankly, friendly ears in the administration, based on my conversations with the President.

VW: Is there an opportunity to take that a step further to the whole foreign policy budget of the government, the United Nations that you've been involved in, support for our embassies abroad that's been underfunded for some time, foreign aid budget, is that a part of the whole response?

JB: No, because . . . and I'm not being . . . I didn't mean to be so sure. (*Laughs*) I don't mean . . . (*Overlap*)

VW: . . . short answer (?) . . .

JB: . . . that's right. (*Scattered Laughter*) Now, well . . . the answer is no for the following reasons. For the federal government to engage in public diplomacy at home is a very dangerous thing, in my view. For us to fund news organizations that promote a governmental position, it seems to me is not what we need, domestically in the United States. But we do need it abroad. What will change, and has changed that, as Ambassador Negroponte knows, he not only . . . I mean, I love the guy. We held him up for God knows how long before we approved him, so everybody made sure any accusation ever against wouldn't rub off on them, and they all turned out to be false, and we approved unanimously, wasn't it? I don't think anybody voted against it. And he went up there and did something no one's been able to do, including Prince Holbrooke, no one's been able to do this. (*Laughter*) And you know what he did? He went up and there and got immediately the right wing Republicans to free up the money in the House. You know what did that? The world changed. They did not want to have to, as former Senator Carol Moseley Braun would say, wear the jacket of us not being able to put together a coalition because he was unable to do his job in the United Nations because he had to face the constant charge that we weren't meeting our end of the deal.

So I think events alter those kinds of things and I think you're going to see foreign policy much more on the front burner of American domestic politics for the reasons that were stated at the outset, that we'll, in fact, up those budgets and people are beginning to understand the complexity. It's not all military, it's diplomacy. We have to lead in other ways, and I think that will be helped by this terrible circumstance.

VW: Senator Biden, thank you for . . . (*Overlap*)

DG: I'm Dick Garwin, Council on Foreign Relations. Thank you for an insightful and constructive presentation. Now, on the ABM Treaty and missile defense, I can just say Amen, but the rest of the topics you mentioned, we need to have not only some priorities, but more than that. That administration and the Congress are going to have to do a number of things together. First, it seems to me that we have to have refugee camps, and the refugee camps have to be training grounds for democracy. So, we need to work with the United Nations to do this, and to accomplish that. We need to provide security, but we need to provide more than security.

The next priority I think has to be the chemical and biological weapons conventions, especially the BWC . . . essentially all the nations of the world have signed up, but they're not all obeying it. They're not all doing what they said. Before we have any compliance, we've got to have them say, we're going to do this, we're passing a law, everybody has to stop affiliating with biological weapons and we're going to destroy our stocks. Seems to me that's the next. And finally, in my talk, is the Pakistani nuclear weapons. You read in the New York Times Bruce Wehr(?), saying we ought to provide means of going in, and capturing them in case Pakistan regime falls. Well, we'll get a lot more cooperation if we fund Pakistani regime in order to destroy their own, or render them ineffective if the regime falls, and with uranium weapons that can be done in reasonably expeditious fashion. But how do you solve the problem of priorities, and doing a number of things at the same time which neither administrations nor Congress are good at?

JB: Let me tell you, I fully agree with your list, I shortened my speech on the fly here, I'll give you a copy of it, it mentions all three of those things, particularly the biological and chemical weapons treaty and the implementation. And I think you do just what you said. Those discussions are underway with the Democratic Congress and the Republican members of Congress and the President on setting those priorities. The question is, the President has an internal dilemma he has to overcome first. He is focusing on first things first, but then he has to deal with . . . and I'm going to get in trouble for saying this . . . but he has to deal with what has not gone away. There is, for lack of a better phrase, still a Rumsfeld-Powell split on how they look at the world, and how they look at these very issues that you've stated here. I was discussing here at my table, my perception, and maybe, what's that old expression, the father is . . . the wish is the father of the thought, or whatever it is, that maybe I'm just sort of making this up as I go along because I want to feel it. But my impression is, this President is arriving at his own foreign policy. He is arriving at his own foreign policy. I think he accepted wholesale sort of the movement right position on foreign policy issues, because as a Governor he hadn't paid much attention to those. And I think he's finding that those as a prescription don't fit the modern day world as easily as he thought they may.

And so I see the first thing that has to happen is the President himself has to decide

what he thinks about these issues. And I hope we throw in CTBT here, because I think to me that is one of the . . . that is the single most important thing we could do at the front end. But . . . Vin is looking at his watch, understandably, I happen to agree with you. With regard to priorities, Dick Lugar and I are going to be introducing this week after call for a commission that is, I know we got a lot of commissions, but a commission made up, appointed by the President, the House and the Senate, made up of the leading people in America that we could find with the greatest stature, to come forward with us with a threat assessment, a threat assessment that in fact reflects, for purposes of deciding what priorities we should be focusing on. And so I can talk to you more about that later, but my time is . . . (Overlap)

VW: I don't know if we have time for one or two more, but one there, and if there's time for two, it's over there. Les is telling me only one, I'm sorry to say, (inaudible).

M: (inaudible) Talbot(?). Senator, thank you for this broad guarded approach to the problems we face. My question is this, do you foresee the need or the expectation of a Congressional declaration of war, which the Constitution calls for, and if so, against whom? (Scattered Laughter)

JB: The answer is yes, and we did it. I happen to be a professor of Constitutional law. I'm the guy that drafted the Use of Force proposal that we passed. It was in conflict between the President and the House. I was the guy who finally drafted what we did pass. Under the Constitution, there is simply no distinction . . . Louis Fisher(?) and others can tell you, there is no distinction between a formal declaration of war, and an authorization of use of force. There is none for Constitutional purposes. None whatsoever. And we defined in that Use of Force Act that we passed, what . . . against whom we were moving, and what authority was granted to the President.

And why don't you take that question, it's not two o'clock, I'll give a yes or no. He may be from Delaware. (Laughter)

RP: Roland Paul, Senator, I concur with everybody else in commending you on your comments, and anyone who's heard you before would certainly not be surprised at how good they were. I would return to a question you answered earlier, and you said as long . . . the bombing, every day it goes on, the harder it may be for us to do something in the past(?). What do you see as the situation if we don't defeat the Taliban in the next four weeks, and winter sets in in Afghanistan?

JB: Again, I'm not a military man. I think the American public and the Islamic world is fully prepared for us to take as long as we need to take, if it is action that is *mano-a-mano*. If it's us on the ground going against other forces on the ground. The part that I think flies in the face of and plays into every stereotypical criticism of us is we're this high tech bully that thinks from the air we can do whatever we want to do, and it builds the case for those who want to make the cause against us that all we're doing is indiscriminately bombing innocents, which is not the truth. Some innocents are (indiscriminately) bombed, but that is not the truth. I think the American public is prepared for a long siege. I think the American public is prepared for American losses. I think the American public is prepared, and the President must continue to remind them to be prepared, for American body bags coming home.

There is no way that you can in fact go after and root out al-Qaeda and/or Bin Laden without folks on the ground, in caves, risking and losing their lives. And I believe that

the tolerance for that in the Islamic world is significant . . . exponentially higher than it is for us bombing. That's a generic point I wish to make. I am not qualified enough to tell you, although I can tell you what the military guys have said to me, this is not 1948. This is 2001, I'm not at all they're correct, and our ability to wage conflict in the winter, in parts of this region, is within our control, I don't know enough to vouch for that or not, but I do think it clearly makes it more difficult, and the weather window is closing, as opposed to the tolerance window for a behavior, in my view. Thank you all very, very much. (Applause)

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER). The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Senator from Delaware for his clarification, although there was none required on my part.

Mr. BIDEN. I knew it would not be required on the Senator's part.

Mr. DASCHLE. I have the greatest admiration for the extraordinary experience and leadership provided by the Senator from Delaware. I am not surprised he was misquoted, and I think he is wise. He speaks from experience in coming to the floor to ensure if there is any misunderstanding it has now been clarified.

He did it in a way I would expect. He has come to the Chamber with a complete explanation. I have read some of the remarks because after being asked the question, I was informed of the Senator's comments. I applaud him for the way in which he handled the questions and applaud him as well for his speech. I appreciate his willingness to come to the Chamber, and I thank him for the extraordinary job he does every day as chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. BIDEN. Very briefly in response, I thank the Senator. I know the public listening to this would say they expect two guys who are friends and in the same party to say the same thing, but the truth is we are all going to be tested over the next several months. The President of the United States, who we all think is doing a very fine job, is going to have to make some very tough decisions.

I, for one, and I know my two leaders and the Senator from Oregon as well are not into Monday morning quarterbacking. Some of the decisions we are going to make are going to turn out to be brilliant. Some we are going to make are not going to be so good.

I would say this: This President, in my view, so far has made the right choices. He has done the right thing. He is pursuing the right way. This notion of how long we bomb versus how long before we put forces on the ground is an incredibly difficult decision. You can be assured every single mistake we accidentally make—and by the way, to our credit the Defense Department acknowledged today, like no other Defense Department would, I think, that, yes, there was an errant bomb, and it did take out some innocent people.

What other great nation would acknowledge that?

That is going to happen. It is horrible that it will, but the President has a series of very tough choices. I want him to know that not only I, but we all wish him well, and as long as he is trying, as he is, to keep this coalition together, to keep it moving, I am willing to yield to his judgment in the prosecution of this war.

So I thank my friend for his kind comments, and I hope this puts it to rest. I am sure the gentleman on the House side who made the comments was probably told by staff, and I think it was kind of like a drive-by shooting because I have never had a cross word with this particular House Member, but I understand things got pretty hot in the House today. I think I was the first Democrat who came across his radar, and I think this would be called a political drive-by shooting—accidental, I hope—and it will get straightened out.

I am not criticizing or making light of what was said. I want the RECORD to be straight because it is important the world knows and the Nation knows we are behind the President and we are not at this point second-guessing his judgment, particularly about bombing.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO GENERAL CHARLES T. ROBERTSON, JR.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I wish to take this opportunity to recognize and say farewell to an outstanding Air Force officer, General Charles T. "Tony" Robertson, Jr., upon his retirement from the Air Force after more than 33 years of commissioned service. Over the years, many Members and staff have enjoyed the opportunity to meet with General Robertson on a variety of joint military issues and have come to appreciate his many talents. Indeed, throughout his career, General Robertson has served with distinction, and it is my privilege today to recognize his many accomplishments and to commend him for the superb service he has provided the Air Force and our Nation.

General Robertson entered the Air Force in 1968 as a graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy. After successfully completing pilot training, he served his Nation by flying 150 combat missions as a gunship pilot in Southeast Asia while stationed with the 18th Special Operations Squadron in South Vietnam. Lieutenant Robertson was then assigned to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, where he became a B-52 copilot, aircraft commander, instructor

pilot, and flight examiner with the 17th Bombardment Wing. Moving on to Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, he first became Assistant to the Chief of Staff, then Aide and Executive Officer to the Vice Commander in Chief, Headquarters, Strategic Air Command. His next assignment was to Plattsburgh Air Force Base, New York, as an FB-111 Aircraft Commander, Flight Commander, and Assistant Operations Officer.

As a lieutenant colonel, he served as a Plans and Programming Officer in the Air Force Programs and Evaluation Directorate at the Pentagon before returning to Plattsburgh Air Force Base, in 1982, as Commander, 529th Bomb Squadron, and then as Assistant Deputy Commander for Maintenance, 380th Bombardment Wing. After completing studies at the National War College at Fort McNair in Washington D.C., he was promoted to colonel in 1985.

During that same year, Colonel Robertson returned to the Pentagon to serve as Executive Officer to the Air Force Vice Chief of Staff, Headquarters U.S. Air Force. He went on to become Commander of the 2nd Bombardment Wing, Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, in 1987, then Commander of the 384th Bombardment Wing at McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, in 1989. As Commander of the 384th, Colonel Robertson was honored as the Strategic Air Command Outstanding Wing Commander of the Year for 1989. Following his tour at McConnell, he returned to Offutt Air Force Base where he served as Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Resources, Headquarters Strategic Air Command, and was promoted to Brigadier General in 1991.

As a general officer, General Robertson excelled in a number of key assignments, including Director of Personnel Plans, Headquarters U.S. Air Force and then Vice Director of the Joint Staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon; Vice Commander, Air Mobility Command, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois; Commander, 15th Air Force at Travis Air Force Base, California; and culminating with his current assignment as Commander in Chief, United States Transportation Command, USTRANSCOM, and Commander, Air Mobility Command, AMC.

Over his career, General Robertson demonstrated his skill as an aviator by safely accumulating over 4,700 hours of flight time in the AC-119K, B-1B, B-2, B-52, C-5, C-9, C-17, C-20B, C-21, C-37, C-130, C-141, EC-135, FB-111A, KC-10, KC-135, T-1, T-6, T-37, T-38, and T-39 aircraft.

As Commander in Chief, USTRANSCOM, General Robertson's leadership has been indispensable to the readiness of the Defense Transportation System to accomplish its mission, getting troops to the fight, sustaining the fight, and then bringing the troops back home when the fight is over. As a tireless "Total Force" advocate, his commitment to fully integrating guard

and reserve forces into all aspects of the Command has reaped great dividends and great praise. Recognizing the essential role of our commercial transportation industry in supporting the USTRANSCOM mission, General Robertson lifted this partnership to unprecedented levels through such critical programs as the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, the Maritime Security Program, and the Voluntary Intermodal Sealift Agreement. Following the terrorist bombing of Khobar Towers, and then again after the attack on the USS COLE, the global force protection programs he developed for his always "in-transit" forces were held as the model for others to emulate.

His factual and pointed testimonies before the Senate Armed Services Committee illustrated the professionalism and expertise which has enabled him to foster exceptional rapport with all members of the Senate and was a clear indication of his ability to work with the Congress in addressing the priorities of his Command. Finally, as evidence of his clear vision for the future, he diligently labored to ensure programs such as follow-on C-17 procurement, C-5 modernization, and airlift defensive systems were in-place to ensure the transformation of the mobility fleet to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

An exemplary officer of unmatched skill and talent, General Robertson personifies the Air Force core values of integrity, selfless service, and excellence in all things. I offer my congratulations to him, his wife, Brenda, and sons, Sean and Jason. The Congress and the country applaud the selfless commitment his entire family has made to the Nation in supporting his military career.

I know I speak for all of my colleagues in expressing my heartfelt appreciation to General Robertson. He is a credit to both the Air Force and the United States and I congratulate him on the completion of an outstanding and successful career. May God continue to bless Tony, his family and the United States of America.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred April 20, 2000 in Stafford, VA. Thomas Rivers, 18, allegedly attacked a 15-year-old gay teenager by bashing him in the back of the head with a metal pole, almost killing him. The previous year, after Rivers learned that the younger boy was attracted to him, Rivers lashed out by shouldering him in hallways at school,

shouting slurs and spitting on him. The attack came eight months later when Rivers saw the boy walking in an area park.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER TREATMENT ACT

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I would like to remind the Senate that October is not only Breast Cancer Awareness Month, but also the first anniversary of the enactment of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act. As we take time this month to remember all those who've lost their lives to this tragic disease, we must also celebrate the great strides we've made in diagnosing and treating breast cancer in women from all walks of life.

As many of us remember, the Centers for Disease Control has long operated a program to provide low-income uninsured women with coverage for cancer screening. Since its creation in 1990, the CDC's Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program has proved a great success, providing over one million mammograms to women 40 years or older through March 1999. Of these, over 77,000 were found to be abnormal and 5,830 cases of breast cancer were diagnosed. Additionally, through March 1997, 300 cases of invasive cervical cancer were discovered in over 700,000 pap tests.

Despite this high rate of success, the Early Detection Program contained a fatal flaw. The CDC program provided no treatment options for low-income, uninsured women who tested positive for breast or cervical cancer. Instead of receiving the help they needed, the women diagnosed with cancer under this program were left to find treatment for themselves. Unfortunately, early detection is pointless unless it is followed by immediate and vigorous treatment.

To address this shortcoming, I joined with Senators BARBARA MIKULSKI, OLYMPIA SNOWE, and others to sponsor legislation to allow individual states the option of providing treatment through their state Medicaid programs. As enacted, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act provides enhanced federal matching funds to states that choose to operate a treatment plan for women diagnosed under the CDC program. Instead of imposing a new federal mandate, the bill offered positive incentives and tangible funding options to those states whose populations are most in need.

Today, on the 1-year anniversary of the enactment of this momentous legislation, I'm proud to tell you that the Act has been a great success. Over the

course of the past year, thirty-three states have already begun using the enhanced federal matching funds to provide treatment to women diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer through the CDC screening program. Women across America are already benefiting from treatment program in these thirty-three states.

I am especially proud to note that Rhode Island was one of the first to join. In fact, Governor Lincoln Almond, his wife Marilyn, and the Director of Rhode Island's Human Services Department, Christine Ferguson, were strong and tireless proponents of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act. By leading the charge for this bill at the state level, the Governor and his Human Services Director highlighted once again why Rhode Island has one of the best health-care systems in the country.

#### TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL LEE SELVES

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Oregon native, Michael Lee Selves, an American hero and patriot whose distinguished service to our Nation spanned 32 years. Michael's life was tragically cut short on September 11, 2001, when American Airlines flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon. Michael Selves served this great Nation as both an officer and civilian with the United States Army. Mr. Selves entered the Army in 1969, and during his illustrious career selflessly defended freedom at duty stations in Europe, Korea, and across the United States. Rising to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel before leaving military service, he was admired and respected by superiors and subordinates alike as a gifted and caring leader of soldiers. His numerous decorations include the Legion of Merit and three Meritorious Service Medals.

As a Department of the Army civilian, Mr. Selves brought his leadership skills to the office of the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army. His vast skills were quickly recognized as he was appointed Director of the Army's Information Management Support Center. Under his leadership, a cohesive team of information technology professionals was formed that produced the highest score for customer satisfaction within the Pentagon. The actions of his subordinates in the hours immediately following the attack on the Pentagon attest to his leadership. Despite Mr. Selves' absence, and extensive damage to the automation infrastructure, they were able to restore services within 70 hours.

On behalf of his family and many friends, let the record show that the Congress of the United States of America honors the memory of Michael Lee Selves and the ultimate sacrifice he made for our grateful Nation. My thoughts and prayers are with his family members, especially his wife and

parents, Jack and Florence Selves, and will remain with them in the months to come.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### SENATOR CORZINE'S RECORD

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, on financial matters, our colleague, Mr. CORZINE, has an unparalleled record. He worked his way to the top of the financial world on his own merit. He started as a bond trader and ended up 20 years later as chairman and chief executive officer of Goldman Sachs, one of Fortune magazine's 10 best companies in America. In terms of economics and business, he knows of what he speaks. After conquering the hurdles of the financial world, he has brought his expertise to the Senate. Albert Hunt outlined JON CORZINE's background and philosophy on the economic stimulus package being considered by Congress in the Wall Street Journal on October 11, 2001, and I ask this article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Thurs., Oct. 11, 2001]

##### A SENATOR WHO HAS MET A PAYROLL

##### POLITICS AND PEOPLE

(By Albert R. Hunt)

Which person is better for advice on stimulating the economy: A professor who has spent most of his adult life on the public payroll, or a business executive who headed one of the world's most successful investment-banking firms?

Phil Gramm or Jon Corzine? These two senators have decidedly different approaches to an increasingly faltering economy in the wake of last month's terrorism.

Sen. Corzine, a freshman Democrat from New Jersey who used to be chairman of Goldman Sachs, wants a \$150-billion-a-year stimulus package focused on security spending initiatives and temporary tax cuts to boost consumption. Republican Sen. Gramm, an economics professor at Texas A&M before his 23 years in Congress, wants large and permanent individual and corporate tax cuts directed at upper-income Americans.

President George W. Bush moved toward Mr. Gramm's position when he declared additional stimulus should be limited to more tax cuts.

This appeals to the GOP's "pitchfork-and-torch" crowd—indeed, Mr. Gramm is its intellectual leader in Congress. But the Corzine approach is eminently preferable. It is closer to the goals articulated by congressional budget committees, as well as the public and private testimony of Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan and former Treasury Secretary Bob Rubin: Economic stimulus should pump money quickly into the economy on a temporary basis, not adversely affect longer-term fiscal discipline. President Bush's focus tax cuts fails those tests; Sen. Gramm's proposals are worse.

"The overarching issue," said Sen. Corzine over breakfast this week, "is to get a lot of fiscal stimulus now and avoid fiscal disaster in the long term."

A corporate tax cut now, the investment-banker-turned-senator notes, is misdirected: It rewards previous investments more than encouraging new ones. Better would be short-term accelerated depreciation to encourage new investments.

The Bush administration is pushing a "middle class" tax cut to reduce the 27% tax rate next year to 25%. That's bogus. This rate applies to everyone with taxable income above \$46,700. So for a construction worker making \$65,000, with \$50,000 of taxable income, the tax cut would total \$66. But for anyone making more than \$150,000, with taxable income of over \$112,850, it'd be a \$1,300 tax cut.

As economic stimulus, this idea flounders even more on efficacy than equity. Studies demonstrate lower-income people spend more of their disposable income, and what this economy needs is more consumption. Sen. Corzine, worth \$400 million earlier this year, rejects the GOP's upper-income-oriented tax cuts: "The wealthy, including myself, are not going to change spending habits with such tax cuts."

Making new tax reductions permanent would aggravate persistently high long-term interest rates, he asserts. The opposition to temporary tax cuts by the likes of Glenn Hubbard, chairman of the president's Council of Economic Advisers, is situational; only a few years ago Mr. Hubbard co-authored a paper arguing "temporary investment incentives can have even larger short-run impacts on investment than permanent investment incentives."

Further, the initiatives launched by the White House would, Sen. Corzine notes, "give almost nothing to the people who've been in the front lines—the cops, the firemen who climbed those stairs at the World Trade Center, the grunts who did the cleanup work. That's wrong."

Sen. Gramm questions whether extending jobless claims "has anything to do with stimulus." It's true the unemployed won't put any added money in the secret foreign bank accounts Sen. Gramm has so eagerly protected, but they'll do something more contributory with the money: They'll spend it. The stinginess of the Bush proposals on this score is stunning. If the economic downturn is comparable to the recession of the early 1990s, the president's proposed \$5 billion limited extended jobless claims would be less than one-fifth the \$28 billion spent on such measures a decade ago, calculates Bob Greenstein of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Sen. Corzine is sympathetic to support for expanded jobless benefits and more health insurance coverage for the unemployed—although he doesn't suggest, as the White House does, that we should take some of it out of the Children's Health Insurance Program. He thinks a better approach, however, is temporary "revenue sharing" with fiscally pressed state and local governments, which would head off counterproductive budget cuts or tax hikes. "If we don't do this, much of the stimulus at the federal level will be cut away by state and local tax increases," he says.

He favors major spending investments to bolster the deteriorating economy, geared to the terrorist threat. These include a new federal aviation authority air-control system; major investments in transportation infrastructure, such as bridges and tunnels ("all of which could be terrorist targets"); and assistance for more sophisticated communications systems for local police and fire departments. These spending priorities, he declares, should all be with an eye to greater security.

The former banker is leery of bailing out the myriad industries lining up at the federal trough. After a few changes he voted for the airline bailout—"there are tons of airline jobs in New Jersey"—but fears it wasn't well crafted. He'd make at least one exception: You've got to do something for the insurance industry, otherwise insurance rates will be off the charts and unavailable."

On tax cuts, he would support a tax rebate for the lowest-income people—some 30 million lower-income workers didn't get any cuts in the tax bill enacted this year—but is pushing what he believes is much better idea: a two year "holiday" on a portion of employees' payroll taxes. It would disproportionately go to those most likely to spend it and, he argues, "have a much bigger ongoing effect on stimulus than a one-shot rebate."

Jon Corzine agrees generally with his former partner, Bob Rubin, on the shape of any stimulus, but disagrees on the size. "Bob is too cautious," he worries. "If we're too cautious on the short end, it will come back to haunt us on the back end."

But they're in complete agreement that as central as the need for short-term assistance is the need for long-term fiscal discipline. This is not possible without modifying the huge tax cuts for the wealthy slated to take effect over the next decade. Warns the former top Wall Street executive: "If we don't change the back end of those tax cuts we will have a fiscal train wreck no matter what we do now."•

#### RECOGNITION OF WORLD POPULATION AWARENESS WEEK

• Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I would like to take this time to recognize the week of October 21–28 as "World Population Awareness Week."

Rapid population growth and urbanization have become catalysts for many serious environmental problems. They are applying substantial pressures on infrastructure, manifested especially in pollution, transportation, health, sanitation, and public safety problems. These all make urbanization an issue we cannot afford to ignore. Cities and urban areas today occupy only two percent of the earth's land, but contain half of the world's population and consume 75 percent of its resources.

Therefore, it is important for us to recognize the problems associated with rapid population growth and urbanization. Governor Lincoln Almond has proclaimed the week of October 21–28 as "World Population Awareness Week" in Rhode Island. I ask that Governor Almond's proclamation be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

#### STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS—GUBERNATORIAL PROCLAMATION

Whereas, world population stands today at more than 6.1 billion and increases by some one billion every 13 years; and,

Whereas, the most significant feature of the 20th century phenomenon of unprecedented world population growth was rapid urbanization; and,

Whereas, cities and urban areas today occupy only 2% of the earth's land, but contain 50% of its population and consume 75% of its resources; and,

Whereas, the most rapid urban growth over the next two decades is expected in cities with populations ranging from 250,000 to one million; and,

Whereas, along with advantages and amenities, the rapid growth of cities leads to substantial pressure on their infrastructure, manifested in sanitary, health and crime problems, as well as deterring the provision of basic social services; and,

Whereas, World Population Awareness Week was proclaimed last year by Governors

of 32 states, as well as Mayors of more than 315 United State cities, and co-sponsored by 231 organizations in 63 countries; and,

Whereas, the theme of World Population Awareness Week in 2001 is "Population and the Urban Future"; now,

Therefore, I, Lincoln Almond, Governor of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, do hereby proclaim, October 21–28, 2001, as World Population Awareness Week.●

#### THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MILTON FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, on November 14, 1901, after more than a decade of effort by a group of concerned citizens, the Volunteer Fire Company of Milton, Delaware was organized. The Town Council elected Charles H. Davidson as the first Fire Chief, and 26 men signed up as volunteer firefighters. R.B. Hopkins was named President.

In remembering the founding of the company, its current president, Lynn Rogers, rightly noted that, although the formal Ladies Auxiliary was not organized until years later, the women of Milton provided vital support to the town's fire service from the very start.

By a vote of 76 to 33, the citizens of Milton voted to purchase a fire truck, and the Town bought a Howe chemical and water engine, with the then hefty price tag of \$1,250. In 1902, there was another purchase, a Fire King hose cart that can still be found at the Milton fire station today.

It wasn't long before the resources of the Milton Fire Company and its members were tested to their fullest; a disastrous fire struck the town in August of 1909. In just four hours, with the firefighters and the citizens working together against it, the fire raged through the lower part of Milton, destroying 18 buildings in the business district.

It was the kind of devastation that challenges the spirit and character of a community, just as we have been challenged as a nation this fall. And in the tradition of the American spirit and the American character, Milton came back, with its Fire Company helping to lead the way.

The Milton Fire Department has been a leader in the Delaware Volunteer Firemen's Association from the first meeting in 1921; the current President of the DVFA, Dale Callaway, is from Milton. The Department's leadership has been marked by incredible dedication, with officers who regularly serve for 25 years or more. Just one of many possible examples of this dedication, was when Linwood "Jim" Rogers asked to be replaced after 41 years as Treasurer, Denny Hughes took over, and he continues to hold the office 23 years later.

Over the years, the Milton Fire Department has grown with the town, with a new building dedicated in 1950, an additional property purchase in the 1960s and a renovation and addition in the early 1980s. An ambulance service has grown, from the first ambulance

purchase in 1948, to the dedication of members of the Ladies Auxiliary in the 1970s, who took ambulance attendant courses to ensure quality service.

Lynn Rogers made another comment at the 100th anniversary celebration that I would like to cite. He said, "The fire service of Delaware is a family. We no longer grow as one department; the fire service grows together; we depend on each other more every day, with the specialized emergencies that we all face."

Even beyond the family of our small State, to the broader community of our Nation, we have learned that lesson together in recent weeks—the depths of our bond to one another, how we depend on each other, and the debt and support we owe to those we rely upon in an emergency.

The great tradition of the fire service is alive and well in Milton, DE, and as we approach November 14th, the 100th anniversary of the Milton Fire Department, I am proud to share the pride of Delaware, and to convey the congratulations of the United States Senate, to Chief Jack Hudson, President Lynn Rogers and all the members and friends of the Milton Fire Department and Ladies Auxiliary.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:07 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 980. An act to establish the Moccasin Bend National Historic Site in the State of Tennessee as a unit of the National Park System.

H.R. 1814. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Metacomet-Monadnock-Sunapee-Mattabesett Trail extending through western New Hampshire, western Massachusetts, and central Connecticut for study for potential addition to the National Trails System.

H.R. 2792. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make service dogs available to disabled veterans and to make various other improvements in health care benefits provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2899. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue War Bonds in support of recovery and response efforts relating to the September 11, 2001 hijackings and attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2924. An act to provide authority to the Federal Power Marketing Administrations to reduce vandalism and destruction of property, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2925. An act to amend the Reclamation Recreation Management Act of 1992 in order to provide for the security of dams, facilities, and resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation.

H.R. 3086. An act to provide the Secretary of Education with specific waiver authority to respond to conditions in the national emergency declared by the President of the United States on September 14, 2001.

H.R. 3160. An act to amend the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 with respect to the responsibilities of the Secretary of Health and Human

Services regarding biological agents and toxins, and to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to such agents and toxins.

H.R. 3162. An act to deter and punish terrorist acts in the United States and around the world, to enhance law enforcement investigatory tools, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution providing for a National Day of Reconciliation.

At 5:38 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3090. An act to provide tax incentives for economic recovery.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 8162(c)(3) of Public Law 106-79, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission: Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. BOSWELL of Iowa.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The following enrolled bills, previously signed by the Speaker, were signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD) on October 24, 2001:

H.R. 146. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 182. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Eight Mile River in the State of Connecticut for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1000. An act to adjust the boundary of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site in the State of Ohio, to authorize an exchange of land in connection with the historic site, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1161. An act to authorize the American Friends of the Czech Republic to establish a memorial to honor Tomas G. Masaryk in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1668. An act to authorize the Adams Memorial foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor former President John Adams and his family.

H.R. 2904. An act to authorize the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor former President John Adams and his family.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 980. An act to establish the Moccasin Bend National Historic Site in the State of Tennessee as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1814. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the

Metacomet-Monadnock-Sunapee-Mattabesett Trail extending through western New Hampshire, western Massachusetts, and central Connecticut for study for potential addition to the National Trails System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2792. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make service dogs available to disabled veterans and to make various other improvements in health care benefits provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2899. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue War Bonds in support of recovery and response efforts relating to the September 11, 2001 hijackings and attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 3086. An act to provide the Secretary of Education with specific waiver authority to respond to conditions in the national emergency declared by the President of the United States on September 14, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 3090. An act to provide tax incentives for economic recovery; to the Committee on Finance.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution providing for a National Day of Reconciliation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KYL, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BROWNBAC, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. FRIST, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1572. A bill to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1482

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1482, a bill to consolidate and revise the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture relating to protection of animal health.

S. 1538

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBAC) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1538, a bill to further continued economic viability in the communities on the High Plains by promoting sustainable groundwater management of the Ogallala Aquifer.

AMENDMENT NO. 1843

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, his name was added as a cosponsor of

amendment No. 1843 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2506, a bill making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KYL, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BROWNBAC, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. FRIST, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1572. A bill to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator LUGAR, Senator DURBIN, and fourteen other of our colleagues I send to the desk a bill entitled the Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001. An identical bill is being introduced simultaneously in the House of Representatives by Congressmen DOUG BEREUTER, TOM LANOTOS, and others.

The Freedom Consolidation Act reaffirms what I believe to be a strong and bipartisan Congressional commitment to NATO enlargement. Focusing on the NATO Alliance's Prague summit in November of 2002, the bill endorses the vision of a Europe whole, undivided, free and secure. Indeed, this bipartisan vision has guided U.S. policy toward Europe for the last fifty years.

It's a vision that President Clinton helped to make a reality through the integration of Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary into NATO.

It is also a vision so powerfully reaffirmed by President George W. Bush in Warsaw this past June.

Some hoped that the tragic events of September 11 would weaken the NATO Alliance. In fact, quite the opposite has happened. It has reinvigorated awareness on both sides of the Atlantic that NATO, an organization of collective defense, remains vital to the interests and values of the community of democracies. Moreover, the atrocities of September 11 have reaffirmed the need for the Alliance to move decisively forward on its agenda of enlargement, military modernization, and enhancements of its capacities against weapons of mass destruction.

Today, we can build on NATO's fifty years of joint military planning, training, and operations as the foundation for U.S. and European cooperation in the war against terrorism. Consolidating the zone of peace, democracy and security in Europe should be the cornerstone of our integrated global strategy against the threats of the 21st century.

NATO enlargement must, thus, remain a leading priority of American foreign policy.

Recently, the heads of state of European democracies seeking NATO membership gathered in Sofia, Bulgaria, to explore how they can more effectively contribute to Euro-Atlantic security. Even more important is the fact that these democracies are conducting themselves today as de facto members of the NATO Alliance. Their troops stand shoulder to shoulder with U.S. forces keeping the peace in the Balkans. They were among the first to offer their services, including not only the use of their bases, but even the deployment of their own troops in this war against terrorism.

The most recent round of NATO enlargement, which was ratified by the Senate with an overwhelming 80 votes, has proven to be a success. Polish, Czech, and Hungarian membership have strengthened the Alliance. Their integration into NATO has enhanced European security and stability. And contrary to NATO nay-sayers their integration into NATO has helped to normalize not only their bilateral relationships with Russia, but also relations between Russia and the West.

I am confident that the Alliance's summit in Prague next year will initiate the next round of enlargement, which will strengthen the Alliance. It will help reverse the historic wrongs of Yalta, and it will bring us that much closer to fulfilling the vision of a Europe, whole, free and secure.

I urge my colleagues to consider supporting the Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001, and I urge them to do so.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1922. Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

SA 1923. Mr. WELLSTONE proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1924. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1925. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. VOINOVICH)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1926. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1927. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1928. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. MCCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1929. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1930. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1931. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1932. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1933. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1934. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1935. Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1936. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BROWNBAC, and Mrs. CLINTON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1937. Mr. REID (for Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1938. Mr. REID (for Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1939. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. INOUE)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1940. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. BROWNBAC, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mrs. CLINTON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1941. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. BROWNBAC, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mrs. CLINTON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1942. Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1943. Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1944. Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1945. Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. LEAHY)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1946. Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1947. Mr. LEAHY (for Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1948. Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. SMITH, of Oregon (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. HELMS)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1949. Mr. SPECTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1950. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DODD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KYL, and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1951. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1952. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1953. Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1954. Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. DURBIN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1955. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1956. Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1957. Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. BYRD) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1958. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. BROWNBAC, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. FEINGOLD)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1959. Mr. DODD (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1960. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mrs. HUTCHISON (for himself and Mr. INOUE)) pro-

posed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1961. Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1962. Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1963. Mr. LEAHY (for Ms. STABENOW) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1964. Mr. LEAHY (for Ms. LANDRIEU) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1965. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1966. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1921 submitted by Mr. Brownback and intended to be proposed to the bill (H.R. 2506) supra.

SA 1967. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. SARBANES) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

SA 1968. Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. SMITH, of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, supra.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1922. Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Afghanistan's neighbors should reopen their borders to allow for the safe passage of refugees, and the international community must be prepared to contribute to the economic costs incurred by the flight of desperate Afghan civilians;

(2) as the United States engages in military action in Afghanistan, it must work to deliver assistance, particularly through overland truck convoys, and safe humanitarian access to affected populations, in partnership with humanitarian agencies in quantities sufficient to alleviate a large scale humanitarian catastrophe; and

(3) the United States should contribute to efforts by the international community to provide long-term, sustainable reconstruction and development assistance for the people of Afghanistan, including efforts to protect the basic human rights of women and children.

SA 1923. Mr. WELLSTONE proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

#### SEC. . UZBEKISTAN.

REPORTS.—Not later than three months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and then six months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees on the following:

(1) The defense article, defense services, and financial assistance provided by the United States to Uzbekistan during the six-month period ending on the date of such report.

(2) the use during such period of defense articles and defense services provided by the United States by units of the Uzbek armed

forces, border guards, Ministry of National Security, or Ministry of Internal Affairs.

(3) The extent to which any units referred to in paragraph (2) engaged in Human rights violations, or violations of international law, during such period.

**SA 1924.** Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 125 line 16, before the period at the end of the line insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading, up to \$100,000 should be made available for an assessment of the causes of the flooding along the Volta River in Accra, Ghana, and to make recommendations for solving the problem”.

**SA 1925.** Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. McCONNELL, and Mr. VOINOVICH)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 133, line 17, after “States” insert the following: “, of which not to exceed \$28,000,000 shall be available for the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying direct loans and guarantees for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia”.

**SA 1926.** Mr. McCONNELL (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 229, line 12, after “steps” insert the following: “, additional to those undertaken in fiscal year 2001.”

On page 229, line 16, strike everything after “(3)” through “law” on line 17, and insert in lieu thereof: “taking steps, additional to those undertaken in fiscal year 2001, to implement policies which reflect a respect for minority rights and the rule of law, including the release of all political prisoners from Serbian jails and prisons.”

**SA 1927.** Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 176, line 15, strike “\$14,500,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$15,500,000”.

**SA 1928.** Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. McCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

#### DISABILITY ACCESS

SEC. . Housing that is constructed with funds appropriated by this Act to carry out

the provisions of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and to carry out the provisions of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989, shall to the maximum extent feasible, be wheelchair accessible.

**SA 1929.** Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 142, line 18, after “That”, insert the following: “of the amount appropriated under this heading, not less than \$101,000,000 shall be made available for Bolivia, and not less than \$35,000,000 shall be made available for Ecuador: *Provided further*, That”.

On page 142, line 25, strike everything after “with” through “General” on page 143, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof: “the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention”.

On page 143, line 6, strike “according to the” and insert in lieu thereof: “in accordance with Colombian laws and regulations, and”.

On page 143, line 10, strike “in place” and insert in lieu thereof: “being utilized”.

On page 143, line 12, after “and” insert: “to”.

On page 216, line 14, strike “concerning” and insert in lieu thereof: “, including the identity of the person suspended and”.

**SA 1930.** Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 127, line 12, strike everything after “rehabilitation” through “Maluka” on line 13, and insert in lieu thereof: “and reconstruction, political reconciliation, and related activities in Aceh, Papua, West Timor, and the Maluku”.

On page 220, line 23, after “Indonesia” insert the following: “, including imposing just punishment for those involved in the murders of American citizen Carlos Caceres and two other United Nations humanitarian workers in West Timor on September 6, 2000”.

On page 221, lines 17 and 18, strike “having in place a functioning system for”.

On page 221, lines 19 and 20, strike “that fund activities”.

**SA 1931.** Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 128, line 9, insert the following:

#### LAOS

Of the funds appropriated under the headings “Child Survival and Health Programs Fund” and “Development Assistance”, \$5,000,000 should be made available for Laos: *Provided*, That funds made available in the previous proviso should be made available only through nongovernmental organizations,

**SA 1932.** Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506,

making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 127, line 19, strike “should” and insert in lieu thereof “shall”.

**SA 1933.** Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 127, line 26, after “law:” insert the following: “*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to provide humanitarian assistance inside Burma by any individual, group, or association unless the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the provision of such assistance includes the direct involvement of the democratically elected National League for Democracy”.

**SA 1934.** Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

#### COMMUNITY-BASED POLICE ASSISTANCE

SEC. . (a) **AUTHORITY.**—Funds made available to carry out the provisions of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used, notwithstanding section 660 of that Act, to enhance the effectiveness and accountability of civilian police authority in Jamaica through training and technical assistance in internationally recognized human rights, the rule of law, strategic planning, and through the promotion of civilian police roles that support democratic governance including programs to prevent conflict and foster improved police relations with the communities they serve.

(b) **REPORT.**—Twelve months after the initial obligation of funds for Jamaica for activities authorized under subsection (a), the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees describing the progress the program is making toward improving police relations with the communities they serve and institutionalizing an effective community-based police program.

(c) **NOTIFICATION.**—Assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

**SA 1935.** Mr. REID (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 179, line 7, after “democracy” insert “, human rights”.

On page 179, line 8, after “which” insert: “not less than \$5,000,000 should be made available for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund of the Bureau of Democracy,

Human Rights and Labor, Department of State, for such activities, and of which”.

**SA 1936.** Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BROWNBAC, and Mrs. CLINTON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

**SEC. . SEPTEMBER 11 DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS PROGRAMS.**

Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading “Economic Support Fund”, not less than \$15,000,000 shall be made available for programs and activities to foster democracy, human rights, press freedoms, and the rule of law in countries with a significant Muslim population, and where such programs and activities would be important to United States efforts to respond to, deter, or prevent acts of international terrorism: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this section should support new initiatives or bolster ongoing programs and activities in those countries: *Provided further*, that not less than \$2,000,000 of such funds shall be made available for programs and activities that train emerging Afghan women leaders in civil society development and democracy building: *Provided further*, That not less than \$10,000,000 of such funds shall be made available for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund of the Bureau of Democracy Human Rights and Labor, Department of State, for such activities: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the authority of this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

**SA 1937.** Mr. REID (for Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert:

**SEC. . UZBEKISTAN.**

**REPORTS.**—Not later than three months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and six months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees describing the following:

(1) The defense articles, defense services, and financial assistance provided by the United States to Uzbekistan during the six-month period ending on the date of such report.

(2) The use during such period of defense articles and defense services provided by the United States by units of the Uzbek armed forces, border guards, Ministry of National Security, or Ministry of Internal Affairs.

(3) The extent to which any units referred to in paragraph (2) engaged in human rights violations, or violations of international law, during such period.

**SA 1938.** Mr. REID (for Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

**SEC. . HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHANISTAN.**

It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) Afghanistan’s neighbors should reopen their borders to allow for the safe passage of refugees, and the international community must be prepared to contribute to the economic costs incurred by the flight of desperate Afghan civilians;

(2) as the United States engages in military action in Afghanistan, it must work to deliver assistance, particularly through overland truck convoys, and safe humanitarian access to affected populations, in partnership with humanitarian agencies in quantities sufficient to alleviate a large scale humanitarian catastrophe; and

(3) the United States should contribute to efforts by the international community to provide long-term, sustainable reconstruction and development assistance for the people of Afghanistan, including efforts to protect the basic human rights of women and children.

**SA 1939.** Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. INOUE)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 153 line 7, after the colon insert the following: “*Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated by this paragraph, not less than \$2,300,000 shall be made available for assistance for Thailand”.

**SA 1940.** Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. BROWNBAC, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mrs. CLINTON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

**SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE FUTURE RECONSTRUCTION OF AFGHANISTAN.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds that:

(1) Prior to the rise of the Taliban in 1996, women throughout Afghanistan enjoyed greater freedoms, compromising 70 percent of school teachers, 50 percent of civilian government workers, and 40 percent of doctors in Kabul.

(2) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women have been banished from the work force, schools have been closed to girls and women expelled from universities, women have been prohibited from leaving their homes unless accompanied by a close male relative, and publicly visible windows of women’s houses have been ordered to be painted black.

(3) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women have been forced to wear the burqa (or chadari)—which completely shrouds the body, leaving only a small mesh-covered opening through which to see.

(4) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women and girls have been prohibited from being examined by male physicians while at the same time, most female doctors and nurses have been prohibited from working.

(5) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women have been brutally beaten, publicly flogged, and killed for violating Taliban decrees.

(6) The United States and the United Nations have never recognized the Taliban as the legitimate government of Afghanistan, in part, because of their horrific treatment of women and girls.

(7) Afghan women and children now make up 75 percent of the millions of Afghan refugees living in neighboring countries in substandard conditions with little food and virtually no clean water or sanitation.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Afghan women organizations must be included in planning the future reconstruction of Afghanistan.

(2) Future governments in Afghanistan should work to achieve the following goals:

(A) The effective participation of women in all civil, economic, and social life.

(B) The right of women to work.

(C) The right of women and girls to an education without discrimination and the re-opening of schools to women and girls at all levels of education.

(D) The freedom of movement of women and girls.

(E) Equal access of women and girls to health facilities.

**SA 1941.** Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. BROWNBAC, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mrs. CLINTON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

**SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE CONDEMNING SUICIDE BOMBINGS AS A TERRORIST ACT.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds that:

(1) Suicide bombings have killed and injured countless people throughout the world.

(2) Suicide bombings and the resulting death and injury demean the importance of human life.

(3) There are no circumstances under which suicide bombings can be justified, including considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

(4) Religious leaders, including the highest Muslim authority in Saudi Arabia, the Grand Mufti, have spoken out against suicide bombings.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Suicide bombings are a horrific form of terrorism that must be universally condemned.

(2) the United Nations should specifically condemn all suicide bombings by resolution.

**SA 1942.** Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 142, line 21, after the colon, insert the following: “*Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, up to \$2,000,000 should be made available to support democracy-building activities in Venezuela”.

**SA 1943.** Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 130, line 4, strike “September 30, 2003”, and insert in lieu thereof: “expended”.

**SA 1944.** Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

#### AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. . The Secretary of the Treasury may, to fulfill commitments of the United States, contribute on behalf of the United States to the seventh replenishment of the resources of the Asian Development Fund, a special fund of the Asian Development Bank, and to the fifth replenishment of the resources of the International Fund for Agriculture Development. The following amounts are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury: \$412,000,000 for the Asian Development Fund and \$30,000,000 for the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

**SA 1945.** Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 133, line 8 insert before the period: “: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$250,000 should be made available for assistance for the Documentation Center of Cambodia:

*Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall report to the Committees on Appropriations on a 3-year funding strategy for the Documentation Center of Cambodia.”.

**SA 1946.** Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 136, line 24 strike “\$25,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof “\$35,000,000”.

**SA 1947.** Mr. LEAHY (for Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 190, between line 14 and 15, insert the follow new subsection:

(f) **SMALL BUSINESS.**—In entering into multiple award indefinite-quantity contracts with funds appropriated by this Act, the United States Agency for International Development may provide an exception to the fair opportunity process for placing task orders under such contracts when the order is placed with any category of small or small disadvantaged business.

**SA 1948.** Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. HELMS)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the

fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 232, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

#### DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MINORITY RELIGIOUS FAITHS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SEC. 581. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for the Government of the Russian Federation after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, unless the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives that the Government of the Russian Federation has not implemented any statute, executive order, regulation, or other similar government action that would discriminate, or would have as its principal effect discrimination, against religious groups or religious communities in the Russian Federation in violation of accepted international agreements on human rights and religious freedoms to which the Russian Federation is a party.

**SA 1949.** Mr. SPECTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

The Senate Finds that—  
Currently 106 Federal judgeships are vacant, representing 12.3 percent of the Federal judiciary;

40 of those vacancies have been declared “judicial emergencies” by the Administrative Office of the Courts;

Last year, at the adjournment of the 106th Congress, 67 vacancies existed, representing 7.9 percent of the judiciary;

In May 2000, when there were 76 Federal judicial vacancies, Senator Daschle stated, “The failure to fill these vacancies is straining our Federal court system and delaying justice for people all across this country”;

In January 1998, when there were 82 Federal judicial vacancies, Senator Leahy stated, “Any week in which the Senate does not confirm three judges is a week in which the Senate is failing to address the vacancy crisis”;

The events of September 11, 2001, make it more important than ever that the branches of the Federal Government should operate at maximum efficiency which requires the Federal judiciary to be as close to full strength as possible;

100 percent of President Reagan’s judicial nominees sent to the Senate prior to the 1981 August recess were confirmed during his first year in office;

100 percent of President George H.W. Bush’s judicial nominees sent to the Senate prior to the 1989 August recess were confirmed during his first year in office;

93 percent of President Clinton’s judicial nominees sent to the Senate prior to the 1993 August recess were confirmed during his first year in office;

President George W. Bush nominated and sent to the Senate 44 judicial nominees prior to the 2001 August recess;

21 of all pending nominees have been nominated to fill “judicial emergencies”; and

The Senate has confirmed only 12 judicial nominees to date, which represents 27 percent of President Bush’s judicial nominations sent to the Senate prior to the 2001 August recess:

It is the sense of the Senate that (1) prior to the end of the first session of the 107th Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary shall hold hearings on, and the Committee on the Judiciary and the full Senate shall have votes on, at a minimum, the judicial nominations sent to the Senate by the President prior to August 4, 2001, and (2) the standard for approving pre-August recess judicial nominations for past administrations should be the standard for this and future administrations regardless of political party.

**SA 1950.** Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DODD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KYL, and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 142, line 17, strike “\$567,000,000” and insert “\$731,000,000, of which, \$164,000,000 shall be derived from reductions in amounts otherwise appropriated in this act.”

**SA 1951.** Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 143, beginning on line 9, strike “and (3)” and all that follows through the colon and insert the following: “(3) effective mechanisms are in place to evaluate claims of local citizens that their health was harmed or their licit agricultural crops were damaged by such aerial coca fumigation, and provide fair compensation for meritorious claims; and (4) within 6 months of the enactment of this provision alternative development programs have been developed, in consultation with communities and local authorities in the departments in which such aerial coca fumigation is planned, and in the departments in which such aerial fumigation has been conducted, such programs are being implemented within 6 months of the enactment of this provision.”

**SA 1952.** Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following sections:

#### SEC. . COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2002.

**SA 1953.** Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 232, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

#### INCREASED PEACE CORPS PRESENCE IN MUSLIM COUNTRIES

SEC. 581.(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, it is more important than ever to foster peaceful relationships with citizens of predominantly Muslim countries.

(2) One way to foster understanding between citizens of predominantly Muslim countries and the United States is to send United States citizens to work with citizens of Muslim countries on constructive projects in their home countries.

(3) The Peace Corps mission as stated by Congress in the Peace Corps Act is to promote world peace and friendship.

(4) Within that mission, the Peace Corps has three goals:

(A) To assist the people of interested countries in meeting the need of those countries for trained men and women.

(B) To assist in promoting a better understanding of Americans on the part of the peoples served.

(C) To assist in promoting a better understanding of other peoples on the part of Americans.

(5) The Peace Corps has had significant success in meeting these goals in the countries in which the Peace Corps operates, and has already established mechanisms to put volunteers in place and sustain them abroad.

(6) The Peace Corps currently operates in very few predominantly Muslim countries.

(7) An increased number of Peace Corps volunteers in Muslim countries would assist in promoting peace and understanding between Americans and Muslims abroad.

(b) STUDY.—The Director of the Peace Corps shall undertake a study to determine—

(1) the feasibility of increasing the number of Peace Corps volunteers in countries that have a majority Muslim population;

(2) the manner in which the Peace Corps may target the recruitment of Peace Corps volunteers from among United States citizens who have an interest in those countries or who speak Arabic;

(3) appropriate mechanisms to ensure the safety of Peace Corps volunteers in countries that have a majority Muslim population; and

(4) the estimated increase in funding that will be necessary for the Peace Corps to implement any recommendation resulting from the study of the matters described in paragraphs (1) through (3).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Peace Corps shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (b).

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

**SA 1954.** Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. DURBIN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506 making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 230, line 6, after “grams” insert the following: “, and to oppose the approval or endorsement of such user fees or service charges in connection with any structural adjustment scheme or debt relief action, including any Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper”.

**SA 1955.** Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL)) proposed an amendment to the

bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

RESTRICTION ON FUNDING FOR CAMBODIAN  
GENOCIDE TRIBUNAL

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to provide equipment, technical support, consulting services, or any other form of assistance to any tribunal established by the Government of Cambodia pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding with the United Nations unless the President determines and certifies to Congress that—

the tribunal is capable of delivering justice for crimes against humanity and genocide in an impartial and credible manner.

**SA 1956.** Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, as follows:

SEC. . EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES FOR CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES.

Notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(e)), during each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003, funds available to the Department of Defense may be expended for crating, packing, handling, and transportation of excess defense articles transferred under the authority of section 516 of such Act to Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Former Yugoslavia Republic of Macedonia, Georgia, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Mongolia, Pakistan, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan: *Provided*, That section 105 of Public Law 104-164 is amended by striking “2000 and 2001” and inserting “2002 and 2003”.

**SA 1957.** Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. BYRD) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. 417. MACHINE READABLE PASSPORTS.

(a) AUDITS.—The Secretary of State shall—

(1) perform annual audits of the implementation of section 217(c)(2)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)(2)(B));

(2) check for the implementation of precautionary measures to prevent the counterfeiting and theft of passports; and

(3) ascertain that countries designated under the visa waiver program have established a program to develop tamper-resistant passports.

(b) PERIODIC REPORTS.—Beginning one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to Congress setting forth the findings of the most recent audit conducted under subsection (a)(1).

(c) ADVANCING DEADLINE FOR SATISFACTION OF REQUIREMENT.—Section 217(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(a)(3)) is amended by striking “2007” and inserting “2003”.

(d) WAIVER.—Section 217(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “On or after” and inserting the following:

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), on or after”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

(B) LIMITED WAIVER AUTHORITY.—During the period beginning October 1, 2003, and ending September 30, 2007, the Secretary of State may waive the requirement of subparagraph (A) with respect to nationals of a program country (as designated under subsection (c)), if the Secretary of State finds that the program country—

(i) is making progress toward ensuring that passports meeting the requirement of subparagraph (A) are generally available to its nationals; and

(ii) has taken appropriate measures to protect against misuse of passports the country has issued that do not meet the requirement of subparagraph (A).”.

**SA 1958.** Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. FEINGOLD)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 232, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

SUDAN

SEC. 581. (a) FINDINGS REGARDING THE NEED FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The war in Sudan has cost more than 2,000,000 lives and has displaced more than 4,000,000 people.

(2) The victims of this 18-year war are not confined to one ethnic group or religion as moderate Moslems in eastern and western Sudan suffer greatly, as do Christians and animists in southern Sudan.

(3) Humanitarian assistance to the Sudanese is a cornerstone of United States foreign assistance policy and efforts to end the war in Sudan.

(4) The United States Government has been the largest single provider of humanitarian assistance to the Sudanese people, providing \$1,200,000,000 in humanitarian assistance to war victims during the past 10 years, including \$161,400,000 during fiscal year 2000 alone.

(5) Continued strengthening of United States assistance efforts and international humanitarian relief operations in Sudan are essential to bring an end to the war.

(b) FINDINGS REGARDING THE NIF GOVERNMENT.—In addition to the findings under subsection (a), the Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The people of the United States will not abandon the people of Sudan, who have suffered under the National Islamic Front (NIF) government.

(2) For more than a decade, the NIF government has provided safe haven for well-known terrorist organizations, including to Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda and the Egyptian Islamic Jihad.

(3) The NIF government has been engaged, and continues to engage, in gross human rights violations against the civilian population of Sudan, including the enslavement of women and children, the bombardment of civilian targets, and the scorched-earth destruction of villages in the oil fields of Sudan.

(c) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—In recognition of the sustained struggle for self-determination and dignity by the Sudanese people, as embodied in the IGAD Declaration of Principles, and the statement adopted by the United States Commission on International

Religious Freedom on October 2, 2001, it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the National Islamic Front (NIF) government of Sudan should—

(A) establish an internationally supervised trust fund that will manage and equitably disburse oil revenues;

(B) remove all bans on relief flights and provide unfettered access to all affected areas, including the Nuba Mountains;

(C) end slavery and punish those responsible for this crime against humanity;

(D) end civilian bombing and the destruction of communities in the oil fields;

(E) honor the universally recognized right of religious freedom, including freedom from coercive religious conversions;

(F) seriously engage in an internationally sanctioned peace process based on the already adopted Declaration of Principles; and

(G) commit to a viable cease-fire agreement based on a comprehensive settlement of the political problems; and

(2) the President should continue to provide generous levels of humanitarian, development, and other assistance in war-affected areas of Sudan, and to refugees in neighboring countries, with an increased emphasis on moderate Moslem populations who have been brutalized by the Sudanese government throughout the 18-year conflict.

**SA 1959.** Mr. DODD (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following new section:

Sec. . During fiscal year 2002 funds in this Act that would otherwise be withheld from obligation or expenditure under Section 490 with respect to countries in the Western Hemisphere may be obligated or expended provided that—

(a) Not later than November 30 of 2001 the President has submitted to the appropriate congressional committees a report identifying each country in the Western Hemisphere determined by the President to be a major drug-transit country or major illicit drug producing country.

(b) In each report under subsection (a), the President shall also—

(1) designate each country, if any, identified in such report that has failed demonstrably, during the previous 12 months, to make substantial efforts—

(A) to adhere to its obligations under international counter narcotics agreements; and

(B) to take the counter narcotics measures set forth in section 489(a)(1); and

(2) include a justification for each country so designated.

(c) **LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGNATED COUNTRIES.**—In the case of a country identified in a report for a fiscal year 2002 under subsection (a) that is also designated under subsection (b) in the report, United States assistance may be provided under this act to such country in fiscal year 2002 only if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) provision of such assistance to the country in such fiscal year is vital to the national interests of the United States; or

(2) commencing at any time after November 30, 2001, the country has made substantial efforts—

(A) to adhere to its obligations under international counternarcotics agreements; and

(B) to take the counternarcotics measures set forth in section 489(a)(1).

(d) **INTERNATIONAL COUNTERNARCOTICS AGREEMENT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “international counternarcotics agreement” means—

(1) the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances; or

(2) any bilateral or multilateral agreement in force between the United States and another country or countries that addresses issues relating to the control of illicit drugs, such as—

(A) the production, distribution, and interdiction of illicit drugs,

(B) demand reduction,

(C) the activities of criminal organizations,

(D) international legal cooperation among courts, prosecutors, and law enforcement agencies (including the exchange of information and evidence),

(E) the extradition of nationals and individuals involved in drug-related criminal activity,

(F) the temporary transfer for prosecution of nationals and individuals involved in drug-related criminal activity,

(G) border security,

(H) money laundering,

(I) illicit firearms trafficking,

(J) corruption,

(K) control of precursor chemicals,

(L) asset forfeiture, and

(M) related training and technical assistance; and includes, where appropriate, time-tables and objective and measurable standards to assess the progress made by participating countries with respect to such issues; and

(e) Section 490 (b)–(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j) shall not apply during FY 2002 with respect to any country in the Western Hemisphere identified in subsection (a) of this section.

(f) **STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section supersedes or modifies the requirement in section 489(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (with respect to the International Control Strategy Report) for the transmittal of a report not later than March 1 of 2002 under that section.

(g) **SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ENHANCED INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL.**—

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) many governments are extremely concerned by the national security threat posed by illicit drug production, distribution, and consumption, and crimes related thereto, particularly those in the Western Hemisphere;

(2) an enhanced multilateral strategy should be developed among drug producing, transit, and consuming nations designed to improve cooperation with respect to the investigation and prosecution of drug related crimes, and to make available information on effective drug education and drug treatment;

(3) the United States should at the earliest feasible date convene a conference of representatives of major illicit drug producing countries, major drug transit countries, and major money laundering countries to present and review country by country drug reduction and prevention strategies relevant to the specific circumstances of each country, and agree to a program and timetable for implementation of such strategies; and

(4) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President should transmit to Congress any legislation necessary to implement a proposed multilateral strategy to achieve the goals referred to in paragraph (2), including any amendments to existing law that may be required to implement that strategy.

**SA 1960.** Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. INOUE))

proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 120, line 3, strike “\$1,455,500,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$1,465,500,000.”

On page 121, line 6, after “diseases” insert the following: “, of which not less than \$65,000,000 should be made available for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on, tuberculosis”.

On page 142, line 17, strike “\$567,000,000” and insert the lieu thereof: “\$557,000,000”.

**SA 1961.** Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 142, line 17, strike “\$567,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$557,000,000”.

On page 124, line 17, strike “\$1,235,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$1,245,000,000”.

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

#### CENTRAL AMERICA DISASTER RELIEF

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated under the headings “International Disaster Assistance”, “Development Assistance”, and “Economic Support Fund”, not less than \$35,000,000 should be made available for relief and reconstruction assistance for victims of earthquakes and drought in El Salvador and elsewhere in Central America.

**SA 1962.** Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 116, line 23, delete “\$753,323,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$727,323,000”.

On page 145, line 17, delete “\$326,500,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$318,500,000”.

On page 157, line 3, strike “CONTRIBUTION” and all that follows through the period on line 8.

On page 136, line 9, delete “\$800,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$795,500,000”.

On page 128, line 13, delete “\$255,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$245,000,000”.

On page 133, line 13, delete “\$603,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$615,000,000”.

On page 121, line 5, delete “\$175,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$185,000,000”.

On page 121, line 6, after “diseases” insert: “, of which not less than \$65,000,000 should be made available to combat malaria”.

On page 159, line 13, delete “\$217,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$218,000,000”.

On page 160, line 1, delete “\$39,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$40,000,000”.

On page 120, line 3, delete “\$1,455,500,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$1,500,500,000”.

On page 120, line 24, delete “\$415,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$450,000,000”.

On page 120, line 25, delete “\$40,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof: “\$90,000,000”.

**SA 1963.** Mr. LEAHY (for Ms. STABENOW) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 232, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

## PROJECTS HONORING VICTIMS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS

SEC. 581. The National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.) is amended by inserting before title V the following:

**"TITLE IV—PROJECTS HONORING VICTIMS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS"**

"(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'Foundation' means the Points of Light Foundation funded under section 301, or another nonprofit private organization, that enters into an agreement with the Corporation to carry out this section.

"(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS.—

"(1) ESTIMATED NUMBER.—Not later than December 1, 2001, the Foundation, after obtaining the guidance of the heads of appropriate Federal agencies, such as the Director of the Office of Homeland Security and the Attorney General, shall—

"(A) make an estimate of the number of victims killed as a result of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 (referred to in this section as the 'estimated number'); and

"(B) compile a list that specifies, for each individual that the Foundation determines to be such a victim, the name of the victim and the State in which the victim resided.

"(2) IDENTIFIED PROJECTS.—The Foundation shall identify approximately the estimated number of community-based national and community service projects that meet the requirements of subsection (d). The Foundation shall name each identified project in honor of a victim described in subsection (b)(1)(A), after obtaining the permission of an appropriate member of the victim's family and the entity carrying out the project.

"(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to have a project named under this section, the entity carrying out the project shall be a political subdivision of a State, a business, or a nonprofit organization (which may be a religious organization, such as a Christian, Jewish, or Muslim organization).

"(d) PROJECTS.—The Foundation shall name, under this section, projects—

"(1) that advance the goals of unity, and improving the quality of life in communities; and

"(2) that will be planned, or for which implementation will begin, within a reasonable period after the date of enactment of this section, as determined by the Foundation.

"(e) WEBSITE AND DATABASE.—The Foundation shall create and maintain websites and databases, to describe projects named under this section and serve as appropriate vehicles for recognizing the projects."

**SA 1964.** Mr. LEAHY (for Ms. LANDRIEU) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 125, line 16, before the period at the end of the line insert the following: " : *Provided further*, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading or under 'Child Survival and Health Programs Fund' \$5,000,000 should be made available for activities in South and Central Asia aimed at reintegrating 'child soldiers' and other war-affected youth".

**SA 1965.** Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 137, line 17 through page 138 line 11, strike all after "(e)" through "assistance."

**SA 1966.** Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1921 submitted by Mr. BROWBACK and intended to be proposed to the bill (H.R. 2506) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the word sec. and add the following:

Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act shall not apply to—

(A) activities to support democracy or assistance under Title V of the FREEDOM Support Act and section 1424 of Public Law 104-201 or nonproliferation assistance;

(B) any assistance provided by the Trade and Development Agency under section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2421);

(C) any activity carried out by a member of the United States and Foreign Commercial Services while acting within his or her official capacity;

(D) any insurance, reinsurance, guarantee or other assistance provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation under title IV of Chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2191 et seq.);

(E) any financing provided under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; or

(F) humanitarian assistance.

(2) The President may waive section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act if he determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that to do so:

(A) is necessary to support United States efforts to counter terrorism; or

(B) is necessary to support the operational readiness of United States Armed Forces or coalition partners to counter terrorism; or

(C) is important to Azerbaijan's border security; and

(D) will not undermine or hamper ongoing efforts to negotiate a peaceful settlement between Armenia and Azerbaijan or be used for offensive purposes against Armenia.

(3) The authority of paragraph (2) may only be exercised through December 31, 2002.

(4) The President may extend the waiver authority provided in paragraph (2) on an annual basis on or after December 31, 2002 if he determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2).

(5) The Committees on Appropriations shall be consulted prior to the provision of any assistance made available pursuant to paragraph (2).

(6) Within 60 days of any exercise of the authority under Section (2), the President shall send a report to the appropriate Congressional committees specifying in detail the following:

(A) the nature and quantity of all training and assistance provided to the government of Azerbaijan pursuant to Section (2);

(B) the status of the military balance between Azerbaijan and Armenia and the impact of U.S. assistance on that balance; and

(C) the status of negotiations for a peaceful settlement between Armenia and Azerbaijan and the impact of U.S. assistance on those negotiations.

**SA 1967.** Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. SARBANES) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending

September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 152 line 10, after the word "Appropriations" and before the period insert the following: " : *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated by this paragraph, not less than \$600,000 shall be made available for assistance for Armenia".

On page 153 line 7, after the colon, insert the following: " : *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated by this paragraph, not less than \$4,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Armenia".

**SA 1968.** Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2506, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

**SEC. . FEDERAL INVESTIGATION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2001.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Federal Investigation Enhancement Act of 2001."

(b) UNDERCOVER INVESTIGATIVE PRACTICES CONDUCTED BY FEDERAL ATTORNEYS.—Section 530 B(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence, "Notwithstanding any provision of State law, including disciplinary rules, statutes, regulations, constitutional provisions, or case law, a Government attorney may, for the purpose of enforcing Federal law, provide legal advice, authorization, concurrence, direction, or supervision on conducting undercover activities, and any attorney employed as an investigator or other law enforcement agent by the Department of Justice who is not authorized to represent the United States in criminal or civil law enforcement litigation or to supervise such proceedings may participate in such activities, even though such activities may require the use of deceit or misrepresentation, where such activities are consistent with Federal law."

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET****COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 24, 2001, for the purpose of holding a hearing on terrorism insurance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 24, 2001, at 10:30 a.m., to hold a nominations hearing.

**Agenda**

Nominees: Mr. Cameron R. Hume, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa; Ms. Margaret K. McMillion, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Rwanda; Ms. Wanda L. Nesbitt, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Madagascar; and Mr. Robert V. Royall, of South Carolina, to be

Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to hold a closed hearing on intelligence matters on Wednesday, October 24, 2001, at 2:30 p.m., in room S-407 in the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to staff members of the Foreign Relations Committee, Lauren Marcott and Robert Hyams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Madeline Lohman, an intern in my office, be allowed to be on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2001

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 9:30 a.m. Thursday, October 25, and on Thursday, immediately following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there be a period for morning business until 10:00 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the fol-

lowing exception: Senator HUTCHISON from Texas or her designee, 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DASCHLE. At 10 a.m. on Thursday, the Senate will begin consideration of the counterterrorism act with 5 hours and 10 minutes of debate.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if there are no further requests for morning business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:09 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 25, 2001, at 9:30 a.m.